A STUDY OF ADMINISTRATOR PERCEPTIONS OF STATE MANDATED TEACHER EVALUATION: THE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT AND IOWA TEACHER QUALITY LAW

A Dissertation
Presented to
the School of Education
Drake University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

by Bruce Carl Amendt
June 2004

A STUDY OF ADMINISTRATOR PERCEPTIONS OF STATE MANDATED TEACHER EVALUATION: THE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT AND IOWA TEACHER QUALITY LAW

by Bruce Carl Amendt

June 2004

Approved by Committee:

Eunice Merideth, Chair

David Darnell

James Casey

Salina Shrofel
Dean of the School of Education

A Study of Administrator Perceptions of State Mandated Teacher Evaluation: The Student Achievement and Iowa Teacher Quality Law

An abstract of a Dissertation by
Bruce Carl Amendt
June 2004
Drake University
Chair: Eunice Merideth

The problem. Because of the high stakes for teachers and the expected levels of achievement for students, there is a clear need for specific data about the current state of implementation and effectiveness of Iowa's Teacher Quality Evaluation Standards and Criteria.

Procedure. A survey was electronically mailed to 333 Iowa administrators who were randomly selected from a list of Iowa administrators identified as having had first and second year teachers employed in their school district. One-Way ANOVAs were utilized to determine any significant differences between the means of administrative subgroups.

Findings. Administrators with 0-3 years of experience believe at a significantly higher level than administrators with more experience that teacher evaluation has improved, and that they are better able to identify teacher effectiveness. Administrators from smaller schools believe at a significantly higher rate than larger school administrators that additional administrator training is needed on teacher evaluation and teacher effectiveness. In addition, 68% of Iowa administrators believe teacher evaluation has improved, but that the time spent at this task has increased dramatically. Ninety-three percent reported they were spending increased time on teacher evaluation. The majority of administrators (52%) believe they do not need additional training about teacher effectiveness and evaluation, while 67% believe teachers need further training about teacher effectiveness evaluation. Eighty-six percent reported their school district would be ready for full implementation with all teachers by July 2005. Finally, only 39% expected student achievement in their school to improve because of implementing the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria.

Recommendations. Additional research is needed about the following topics: 1.Teachers' perceptions about the implementation of the ITS evaluation process, 2 Administrators' perceptions about teacher evaluation, teacher effectiveness, and student achievement after 2005-2006, 3. Administrators' perceptions about the time needed for teacher evaluation after 2005-2006, 4. The impact of teacher evaluation on student achievement.

Table of Contents

Page

List of Tables v

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION.....1

Research Questions.....8

Statement of Hypothesis.....9

Definition of Terms 9

Limitation of the Study. 12

2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....14

Teacher Effectiveness and Student Achievement.....14

Evaluation of Teacher Effectiveness.....27

Teacher Evaluation in Iowa in 2003.....28

Historical Review of the Literature.....36

Quality Teacher Evaluation in the 21st Century.....49

Professional Growth.....55

Valid Teacher Evaluation 61

Summary.....63

3. METHOD.....66

Research Questions.....66

Statement of Hypothesis 67

Procedures 67

Data Analysis 71

4. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA.....73

Introduction.....73

Descriptive Data Analysis.....74

Inferential Statistical Analysis.....86

Qualitative Analysis of Open-Ended Questions.....92

5. SUMMARY CONCLUSION DISCUSSION RECOMMENDATIONS .103

Summary 103

Conclusions.....103

Discussion.....108

Recommendations 114

REFERENCES 119

APENDIXES

A. Iowa Teaching Standards 128

B. Letter to Administrators 133

C. Email to Administrators 135

D. Administrator Questionnaire 137

E. ANOVA data: Administrative Grade Levels Supervised 144

F. ANOVA data: Years of Administrative Experience 152

G. ANOVA data: School Size Classification 160

Tables

Table Page

1. Level of Administrative Service.....76

2. Administrative Experience.....77

3. School District Size Classification.....78

4. Area Education Agency of Administrator.....79

5. Number of First and Second Year Teachers Evaluated.....80

6. Administrator Perception Ratings of Iowa Teaching Standards.....81

7. Administrative Time Spent on Teacher Evaluation.....84

8. Administrator Perception Ratings of Training.....85

9. ANOVA Data: Significant Item by Grade Levels Supervised, Additional Administrator Training Needed.....87

10. ANOVA Data: by Years of Administrative Experience, Improved Teacher Evaluation.....88

11. ANOVA Data: by Years of Administrative Experience, on Effectiveness of Administrator Ten-Day Training.....89

12. ANOVA Data: by School Size, on need for Training on Teacher Effectiveness.....90

13. ANOVA Data: by School Size, on need for Additional Administrator Training on Teacher Evaluation.....91

14. Appendix E: Administrative Grade Level Supervised, Item ANOVA Data 144

15. Appendix F: Years of Administrative Experience, Item ANOVA Data 152

16. Appendix G: School Size, Item ANOVA Data 160

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The school's mission is to educate students; therefore, the effectiveness of teachers' performance is an important component of that mission. In recognition of the significance of teacher performance, numerous education researchers have proposed methods to evaluate teacher and instructional effectiveness in the classroom.

Danielson (1996 & 2002) has argued that many aspects of teaching could be identified as promoting increased student learning. The framework teaching proposed by Danielson clusters effective teaching into 22 components and four domains: planning and preparation, classroom environment, instruction, and professional responsibilities. While a domain is broad, the components define a distinct aspect of a domain. For example, the domain of planning and preparation is clarified by the following six components.

1. The teacher demonstrates knowledge of content.
2. The teacher demonstrates knowledge of students.
3. The teacher selects instructional goals.
4. The teacher demonstrates knowledge of resources.
5. The teacher designs coherent instruction.
6. The teacher assesses student learning.

The components are further broken down and defined by elements. The elements that clarify component one: The teacher demonstrates knowledge of content, are listed below.

a. The teacher demonstrates knowledge of content.

b. The teacher demonstrates knowledge of prerequisite relationships.

c. The teacher demonstrates knowledge of content-related pedagogy.

Thus, Danielson's *Framework for Teaching* outlines and illustrates the complexity of teaching in detail.

Danielson has stated this framework could be used to enhance teacher performance. The framework provides direction needed by beginning teachers and assistance to experienced teachers to improve their effectiveness. Additionally, she argues that the framework could be used for mentoring and supervising teachers for improved teacher effectiveness. Clearly defined components can assist both the teacher and the evaluator in determining which components of effective teaching to concentrate on.

Muijs and Reynolds (2001) assert that school improvement and school effectiveness should move to look at the classroom level, or teacher effectiveness in the classroom. They argue that individual teacher effectiveness and the effectiveness of student instruction in each classroom are the important factors in determining how students perform at that school.

Muijs and Reynolds (2001) have argued that specific effective teaching skills in the areas of direct instruction, interactive teaching, review and practice of

skills, classroom management, behavior management, classroom climate, effective use of homework, and the use of problem-solving and higher order thinking skills, would enhance student learning.

Over time, teacher evaluation systems and processes have been developed to assist evaluators and teachers in the determination and identification of effective teaching. These evaluation systems reflect the prevalent professional thought of their era about effective teaching. In Chapter 2 of this dissertation, a discussion of past teacher evaluations systems, and these systems' linkages to attributes and evidence of effective teaching will be reviewed in detail. This review will document how teacher evaluation has evolved from focusing on teachers traits, to clinical supervision focusing on observation data and notes, to teacher knowledge tests and student achievement scores, to the contemporary belief that teacher evaluation should be connected to improved teaching and improved student learning.

Davis, Ellett, and Annunziata (2002) support this contemporary belief that teacher evaluation should be connected to student learning, teacher improvement, and school improvement. They state administrators, teachers, and school leaders should use teacher assessment and evaluation systems to:

1. Encourage collaborative group engagement.
2. Enhance opportunities to improve student learning.
3. Define and discuss processes for improving student achievement.

4. Support positive organization change.
5. Create greater program coherence
6. Build strong professional relationships that strengthen leadership density.
7. Strengthen individual and collective efficacy beliefs. (p. 299)

To identify and to help ensure the effectiveness of teachers' performance and quality student instruction, school administrators are required to evaluate teachers. Therefore, how an administrator identifies teacher effectiveness and incorporates that information into the teacher evaluation process becomes critical in linking teacher effectiveness and student achievement. In a small number of states, school districts are given the authority to develop their own methods of identifying effective teaching and incorporating those methods into the teacher evaluation process. However, the review of literature shows that the majority of states mandate the components of teacher evaluation. In fact, Veir and Dagley (2002) state that in 2000 forty-two states had statutory language that directed teacher evaluation.

In 2001, the Iowa Legislature passed and Governor Vilsack signed into law Senate File 476, *A Student Achievement and Teacher Quality Law.* This law mandated the statewide incorporation of eight new teaching standards and 42 criteria into the teacher evaluation process of all public school districts. School districts were required to incorporate these standards and criteria into the teacher evaluation process for first and second year teachers by July 1, 2002.

As a result of this law, experienced teachers with more than two years of teaching experience would be evaluated with a process using the new teaching standards and criteria by July 1, 2004. However, due to Iowa's financial condition, the 2003 Legislature moved the deadline for implementation of the standards and criteria into the evaluation process for experienced teachers to July 1, 2005. The legislature determined that Iowa could not afford to pay for the planned implementation of the related career ladder increases mandated with implementation of the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria for experienced teachers.

Before the adoption of the Student Achievement and Teacher Quality Law in 2001, Iowa school districts developed their own evaluation processes, which included locally adopted standards and criteria defining teacher effectiveness at the local level. The adoption of school district standards and criteria for the teacher evaluation process was under the authority of the local school board.

The requirement of statewide standards and criteria for teacher evaluation has been a significant shift from local control and decision making to active state involvement in the teacher evaluation process in each of Iowa's public school districts. While this is a recent shift in Iowa, as stated previously, Veir and Dagley's (2002) research shows in 2000, forty-two states had statutory language regulating the evaluation of classroom teachers.

As a result of the mandated teacher evaluation standards and criteria, all school personnel responsible for evaluating first and second year teachers were

required to receive ten days of evaluator training during the 2002-2003 school year. This training was designed to provide evaluators with a common language and understanding of the new Iowa teacher evaluation standards and criteria. The first four days of training focused on Data Driven Leadership. Evaluators received training about the effective use of data to guide professional decision-making. The remaining six days of training focused on understanding the new teaching standards, feedback and coaching techniques, and data collection skills.

Currently, all evaluations of beginning first and second year teachers are to be completed by an evaluator with the ten days of training. This evaluation is to include feedback and documentation of teacher effectiveness as defined by the new standards and criteria. At the end of the teacher's second year in the teaching profession, a report of the teacher's effectiveness and a determination of ongoing licensure renewal are to be submitted by the evaluator to the Department of Education.

The process of teacher evaluation takes on an even greater importance when the purpose is extended to moving beyond determining the competency of each teacher and the continued employment of the teacher within a specific school district to making a decision and recommendation concerning the teacher's continued possession of an Iowa teaching license. Because of these high stakes for teachers and the expected levels of achievement for students, there is a clear need for specific data about the current state of implementation

and effectiveness of Iowa's Teacher Quality Evaluation Standards and Criteria. Iowa educators, the School Administrators of Iowa organization, the Iowa Department of Education, the Iowa School Board Association, and the Iowa Legislature need appropriate and current data on the implementation and adoption status of the teacher evaluation standards. This data will assist in determining if the process is being implemented as planned, and, if after one and one-half years, the new law is causing a change in the identification of effective teaching practices in Iowa schools.

Furthermore, this data is important to gather, as according to the Iowa Department of Education 359 of Iowa's 371 school districts employed first or second year teachers during the 2002-2003 school year. Therefore, 96.8% of Iowa's school districts have been immediately impacted by the *Student Achievement and Teacher Quality* legislation and resulting laws.

This study investigated the initial implementation and incorporation of the new standards and criteria into the teacher evaluation processes in Iowa school districts from the administrator's perspective. Consequently, the study gathered and focused on data that provided insight into Iowa administrators' perceptions of the implementation process and any resulting changes in the teacher evaluation for the identification of teacher effectiveness. Additionally, the study gathered and analyzed data on administrators' perception of any changes in teacher effectiveness as a result of the implementation of Senate File 476, *A Student*

Achievement and Teacher Quality Law and the state mandated standards and criteria.

The study looked at the differences, if any, between the past and current evaluation systems used in Iowa schools and mandated use of the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria for identifying teacher effectiveness in beginning teachers. This was completed to determine if trends or changes in evaluation practices were taking place in Iowa's public schools.

An electronic survey/questionnaire was sent to select Iowa administrators during December 2003 and January 2004 to gather implementation and perception information about the first one and one-half years of implementation and use of the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria. Administrators were asked about their perceptions of the impact the standards and criteria were having on the teacher evaluation process and the identification of teacher effectiveness in their school district.

Research Questions

The major research questions to be addressed were:

1. What are the perceptions of Iowa administrators about the implementation of the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria for identifying teacher effectiveness of first and second year teachers?
2. Do Iowa administrators believe that the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria can better identity teacher effectiveness of first and second year teachers than previously used systems and processes?

3. What are the perceptions of Iowa administrators about the pending implementation of the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria for identifying teacher effectiveness of experienced teachers by July 1, 2005?

The three research questions are the basis for this research study and lead to the following research hypothesis.

Statement of Hypothesis

There are no perceived differences between the effectiveness of the past evaluation systems and processes of Iowa school districts and the effectiveness of the new systems and processes using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria in identifying teacher effectiveness.

Definition of Terms

Since educational terms are often technical in nature, the terms relevant to this research are defined below.

AEA. The acronym for Area Education Agency. Area Education Agencies are regional service agencies providing educational support service to local school districts. In the 2003-2004 school year Iowa was divided into twelve AEA's.

Beginning Teacher. A teacher new to the teaching profession in either his/her first or second year of teaching. It is also the first level of the Career Paths as set forth in the Teacher Quality Law.

Career Paths. One of the four major components mandated by the Student Achievement and Teacher Quality Law. The law sets four career levels for Iowa teachers (Beginning, Career, Career II and Advanced).

Comprehensive evaluation. The summative evaluation of a beginning teacher completed by an approved evaluator for the purpose of determining Iowa state teaching licensure.

Evaluator. An administrator or other supervisor who has successfully completed an evaluator-training program pursuant to Iowa Code section 284.10.

Formative evaluation. A process that incorporates ongoing dialogue and feedback between a teacher and evaluator over a period of time. It is conducted for enhancing the professional skills of teachers. A formative evaluation precedes the summative evaluation.

Iowa Code, Chapter 284. This section of the Code of Iowa contains teacher performance, teacher compensation, and teacher career development guidelines. This section of code provides for the career path, teacher mentoring, and intensive assistance guidelines.

Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria. These standards and criteria are state mandated and are the major component of the Student Achievement and Teacher Quality Law.

Mentee. A beginning teacher who is in the first or second year of the teaching profession.

Mentor. An experienced teacher who is paired with a beginning teacher to provide support and guidance to the beginning teacher.

Mentoring and Induction Program. One of the four major mandated components in the Student Achievement and Teacher Quality Law. All beginning teachers are to be paired with an experienced teacher during the first two years of employment.

Professional Development. The current educational term used to describe training and instruction for administrators and teachers. In the past professional development was called In-service or Staff Development.

Student Achievement and Teacher Quality Law. Legislation that mandated the following four components of: mentoring, career paths, professional development, and team-based variable pay.

Summative Evaluation. The summary evaluation. It is referred to as a "comprehensive evaluation" in Chapter 284.2(3) of the Code of Iowa. The evaluator completes it for the purposes of determining a beginning teacher's level of competency relative to the Iowa Teaching Standards and for recommendation for licensure in Iowa.

Teacher. A teacher is an individual possessing a Iowa practitioner's license as defined under Chapter 272, who is employed in a non-administrative role.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of this study were in part determined by the return response rate on the electronic survey instrument. Generalization of results was dependent upon receiving adequate numbers of returned surveys. Follow up correspondence was done with each administrator to encourage his or her completion of the survey and to address the need for a high rate of return. Administrators who had not completed the survey received two additional email requests to complete the survey. This resulted in a final return rate of 228 of 333 survey, or 68.5%. This high return rate provided for the effective generalization of the results across Iowa schools.

In order to ensure a high response rate, the study focused on Iowa school districts that have employed first and second year teachers, who by law have been evaluated with the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria during the 2002-2003 and/or 2003-2004 school year. Schools employing first and second year teachers were identified through information obtained from the Iowa Department of Education. This information identified not only the school districts that employed first or second year teachers but also specifically identified the individual school buildings where those teacher taught.

An additional limitation may be the accuracy of the responses of each administrator completing the survey. Administrators filling out the questions on the survey incorrectly may affect data accuracy.

In order to ensure accurate data from each administrator, a pilot study was completed on the understandability and the ease of completion of the survey instrument. Four Iowa administrators who had experience evaluating teachers completed an initial review of the survey instrument. Revisions of the survey instrument were made based on the administrators' feedback. Following this initial review of the survey instrument for ease of use a pilot study of the survey was completed. Current Iowa school administrators in the Drake Doctoral Cohort in Educational Leadership were asked to pilot the survey during November 2003. Revisions in the survey instrument were completed, as deemed necessary, following the pilot study.

Since the research project was designed to survey a select group of Iowa public school administrators about the perceived state of implementation and value of the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria in the identification of teacher effectiveness, the resulting conclusions may only be generalizable to Iowa administrators, Iowa teachers, and Iowa school district personnel.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Teacher Effectiveness and Student Achievement

Teacher effectiveness has been said to directly impact student achievement. During recent years, teacher effectiveness has been described in numerous ways: what practices effective teachers should use, what characteristics effective teacher should display, and what impacts the individual teacher has on students. These three descriptions often overlap as one reviews the research on effective teaching.

Those that feel specific teaching and classroom strategies can define effective teaching propose that one can identify specific strategies to enhance teacher effectiveness and student learning (Glasgow & Hicks 2003; Glasser 1993; Martin-Kniep, 2000; Muijs & Reynolds, 2001; and Tileston, 2000).

Wang, Haertel, and Walberg (1993) have proposed that instructional variables can have a significant influence on student learning. These variables include classroom management techniques such as, prompt and efficient handling of classroom routines and tasks, the minimization of classroom interruptions and distractions, classroom materials being readily available, and handling classroom behavior problems with minimal disruptions can enhance student achievement.

Wang, Haertel, and Walberg have also asserted the amount and quality of teacher and student academic interactions has been linked to student outcomes. These academic interactions promote student learning by informing students of subject knowledge structures and enabling students to develop internal representations of these knowledge structures. Teacher questioning of students is an example of this type of academic interaction.

In addition, Wang, Haertel, and Walberg (1993), have stated that the frequency and the quality of teacher and student social interaction has been linked to student learning. Students can develop a sense of self-esteem and classroom or group membership through positive social interactions. Through these social interactions, the teacher can minimize classroom disruptions and develop a classroom culture conducive to learning.

Glasser (1993) has proposed that quality teachers always lead and never boss students in their classrooms. He believed that teachers have to manage their classroom and teach simultaneously. He has developed six specific conditions for quality school work and quality teachers. Glasser has suggested that these conditions are so important that they should be posted on the walls in every classroom. Glasser's six conditions are listed below.

1. There must be a warm, supportive classroom environment. (p. 22)
2. Students should be asked to do only useful work. (p. 23)
3. Students are always asked to do the best they can do. (p. 23)
4. Students are asked to evaluate their own work and improve it. (p. 24)

5. Quality work always feels good. (p. 24)
6. Quality work is never destructive. (p. 25)

Glasser has proposed that if a teacher implements the above six conditions into his/her classroom that the students will feel good and will want to learn more readily than if the conditions are not present. Additionally, he has stated that students will learn control theory and will become aware that quality is what they want and that they can achieve that level of quality in their work.

Tileston (2000) has proposed a longer list of strategies and argues the following strategies are the ten best teaching practices for teachers to implement to increase teacher effectiveness and improve student learning.

1. The teacher creates an enriched and emotionally supportive environment.
2. The teacher uses a variety of teaching strategies that address different student learning styles.
3. The teacher uses strategies that help students make connections from prior learning and prior experiences to learning.
4. The teacher teaches for the development of long-term memory.
5. The teacher integrates higher-level thinking skills.
6. The teacher ensures that collaborative learning is an integral part of the classroom learning procedures.
7. The teacher bridges the educational gaps between all learners, regardless of race, socioeconomic status, sex, or creed.

8. The teacher evaluates student learning through a variety of authentic assessments.
9. The teacher promotes real-world application of learning.
10. The teacher provides seamless integration of technology for high quality instruction.

In an even more lengthy description of effective teaching, Glasgow and Hicks (2003) have developed a list of 91 research-based classroom strategies they assert successful or effective classroom teachers use. They have grouped their 91 strategies into the following broad areas.

1. Interacting and collaborating with students
2. Managing classroom organization and discipline
3. Managing classroom time
4. Organizing curricular goals
5. Developing lesson plans and instructional delivery
6. Using student assessment and feedback to maximize instructional effectiveness
7. Working with special needs students
8. Celebrating diversity in the classroom
9. Integrating technology in the classroom
10. Enhancing teacher self-assessment and reflection
11. Developing a professional teacher identity
12. Enhancing professional relationships with colleagues

13. Fostering a positive relationship with the students' parents.

Glasgow and Hicks believe that focusing on these broad categories of effective teaching will improve classroom instruction. Implementing the strategies identified in each broad category will help both beginning and experienced teachers improve their teaching success.

Another definition of effective teaching that has been argued by Martin-Kniep (2000) is that teachers in their individual classrooms should implement what this researcher defined as good interventions. Martin-Kneip proposed the following eight innovations be implemented in all classrooms.

1. The use of essential questions for student learning.
2. The integration of the curriculum.
3. The use of standards-based curriculum and assessment design.
4. The use of authentic assessment.
5. The use of scoring rubrics.
6. The use of portfolios.
7. The use of student and teacher reflection.
8. The use of action research.

Martin-Kniep believed that these good interventions or innovations would result in student-centered classrooms where students will become self-regulated learners. These interventions would also develop teachers in the manner described below:

> To fully implement all the preceding innovations, teachers need to embrace certain beliefs about themselves and their work, some of which run contrary to common teaching practices. They need to assume responsibility for the design and implementation of their curriculum instead of seeing themselves simply as implementing school, district, or state mandates. They need to focus their attention on students' learning and not on what they should cover from day to day. (p. x)

She further stated the most important belief was that the teacher's attention needed to be placed on students' learning and not on what should be taught. The content students were actually learning was more important than what the students were scheduled to be learning.

While some educators have proposed and studied specific strategies or innovation to enhance teacher effectiveness, Wong and Wong (1998) put forth the premise there are specific characteristics which effective teachers display. They believe that the presence of these teacher characteristics define effective teaching. Wong and Wong (1998) have argued the effective teacher displays three specific characteristics. They assert that within these three overall characteristics effective teachers implement specific teaching and learning strategies.

The first characteristic of effective teachers is that the effective teacher has positive expectations for all children. Specific strategies the effective teacher

uses to show he/she possesses positive expectations for all children include the following.

1. The teacher passes out a written statement of positive expectations to each student on the first day of school.
2. The teacher creates a classroom climate that communicates positive expectations.
3. The teacher attends professional meetings to learn.
4. The teacher has a personal goal of high expectations in all he/she does.

The second characteristic defines the effective teacher as an extremely good classroom manager. Wong and Wong (1998) believe "Effective teachers MANAGE their classroom. Ineffective teachers DISCIPLINE their classroom." (p.83). They believe characteristics of well-managed classrooms include the following items.

1. There is a high level of student involvement in the work.
2. The students have a clear understanding of the learning expectations.
3. There is little wasted time, confusion, or classroom disruptions.
4. The classroom atmosphere is work-oriented, while relaxed and pleasant.

The third characteristic of effective teaching that Wong and Wong have proposed is that the effective teacher knows how to design lessons to help

students reach mastery. Wong and Wong believe this characteristic is evidenced by the following list of specific teaching strategies:

1. The teacher teaches the student, not a subject or a grade level.
2. The teacher maximizes the academic learning time.
3. The teacher ensures that students earn their own achievement.
4. The teacher keeps all students actively engaged in learning throughout the entire classtime.

Furthermore, Wong and Wong have stated student mastery is attained when the student shows that he/she has the ability to use a skill. Student mastery moves beyond the comprehension of a skill, to the ability of each student to apply what is understood.

In furthering the discussion of general classroom teaching effectiveness, Protheroe (2004) and Walberg and Paik (2004) stated there are practices that are general in nature which show strong consistent effects on student learning. Walberg and Paik (2004) reviewed the research on student learning and proposed ten general practices to improve student achievement. Nine of these practices are directly related to classroom instruction.

1. Parental involvement. The home environment is a powerful influence on what students learn both in and out of school. Schools should encourage and assist parents in being involved in creating academic environments at home.

2. Graded homework. Walberg and Paik stated that a synthesis of research shows that the assignment, completions, and grading of homework resulted in positive academic achievement. The homework should be relevant to the lesson and within the students' abilities. Students learn more when their homework is graded and discussed with the teacher.
3. Aligned time on task. Students learn more when they are actively focused on educational goals and time spent in learning is focused. Teachers have a direct role in planning for this focused use of instructional time. Students who are actively engaged in learning activities designed around specific instructional goals make more academic progress than students with less focused study time.
4. Direct teaching. This direct instruction is most effective when there is a systematic sequencing of the lessons, a presentation of new materials and skills, guided practice, feedback to the students, and independent practice.
5. Advanced organizers. Students should be shown the relationships between past learning and current learning. This will help students to better understand current learning. Advanced organizers assist students in focusing on key concepts and can add depth and breadth to what is remembered.

6. Teaching of learning strategies. Students who possess learning strategies can monitor their learning and progress toward a learning goal. This can be evidenced by students taking on the responsibilities of planning and allocating time for study and review.
7. Tutoring. Working with one student or a small group of students with the same abilities and instructional needs can promote learning. Tutoring focuses instruction on the needs of the students and can result in large learning effects.
8. Mastery learning. Results from the more than 50 studies Walberg and Paik reviewed have shown careful sequencing, monitoring, and control of the learning process raises the learning rate. Mastery learning can save learners' time as it focuses the students' instructional time on what needs to be learned. Students who need additional instruction receive it while student who have master the material move on to new instructional material.
9. Cooperative learning. When working in small cooperative groups students can support and increase each other's learning. Students can participate more extensively in the discussion, than possible in large group or whole class instruction. Additionally, students learn teamwork, how to give and receive criticism, and how to plan, monitor, and evaluate their own and other's learning.

10. Adaptive education. This method incorporates a number of instructional techniques to adapt lessons to individual students and small group needs. It often includes tutoring, mastery learning, cooperative learning, and student instruction in learning strategies.

Finally, Marzano (1998) completed a meta-analysis of research on instruction, which utilized a theory that postulated the interactions of four elements; knowledge, the cognitive system, the metacognitive system, and the self-system affected effective teaching. The meta-analysis included a study of over 4,000 effect sizes, which involved an estimated 1,237,000 subjects. The effect size across the knowledge domain of the three systems was .65. Marzano found in this meta-analysis of the research on instruction, three implications about effective classroom instruction which could be inferred from the meta-analysis's data.

The first implication was teachers should identify the knowledge and skills that were the goals of student instruction. Marzano argued it was important for teachers to specifically identify the types of knowledge and/or processes that were to be the targets of student instruction. This specification of knowledge and process targets would result in the development of specific instructional techniques.

The development of specific instructional techniques to use in the classroom was the second implication Marzano put forth. He stated the meta-

analysis showed instructional techniques that used the metacognitive system had strong effects on student learning.

The third implication for teaching was the use of instructional techniques that applied to all types of instructional goals. Marzano proposed teachers should use the following instructional techniques regardless of the instructional goals that were the focus of the unit of instruction.

1. When presenting new knowledge or processes to students, provide them with advanced ways of thinking about the new knowledge or processes prior to presenting them.
2. When presenting students with new knowledge or processes, help them identify what they already know about the topic.
3. When students have been presented with new knowledge or processes, have them compare and contrast it with other knowledge and processes.
4. Help students represent new knowledge and processes in nonlinguistic ways as well as linguistic ways.
5. Have students utilize what they have learned by engaging them in tasks that involve experimental inquiry, problem solving, and (presumably) decision-making and investigations.
6. Provide students with explicit instructional goals and give them explicit and precise feedback relative to how well those goals were met.

7. When students have met an instructional goal, praise and reward their accomplishments.
8. Have students identify their own instructional goals, develop strategies to obtain their goals, monitor their own progress and thinking relative to those goals.
9. When presenting new knowledge or process, help students analyze the beliefs they have that will enhance or inhibit their chances of learning the new knowledge or processes. (pp. 134-135)

Marzano stated the meta-analysis supported the concept that the effective teacher used clear instructional goals. These goals were clearly communicated with parents and students. He said these goals ideally addressed knowledge as well as cognitive, metacognitive, and self-systems. Furthermore, the effective teacher understood the interrelationships between the knowledge domains, the cognitive system, the metacognitive system and the self-system, and used that understanding to making many instructional decisions during each class.

The professional discussion about how one goes about identifying effective teaching and the impact effective teaching has on student achievement should move directly to the discussion of how to identify and evaluate effective teaching in schools and individual classrooms. As stated in Chapter 1, one of the major rationales for school administrators to complete teacher evaluations is to identify effective teaching and to ensure the effectiveness of each teacher's performance in providing quality student instruction. Davis, Ellett, and Annunziata

(2002) stated teacher evaluation often takes place for accountability reasons, but should move toward evaluation of teaching for student learning to support collegiality, to identify teacher professional growth areas, and to collect specific data necessary to improve student learning in the classroom. Therefore, how an administrator identifies teacher effectiveness and incorporates that information into the teacher evaluation process becomes critical in connecting teacher effectiveness and student achievement. This literature review will now move to a review of the current literature on teacher evaluation processes and methodologies to complete the linkage of effective teaching and instruction to teacher evaluation methods, techniques, and processes.

Evaluation of Teacher Effectiveness

The topic of teacher evaluation has received much attention over the past thirty years in educational research. During those thirty years, numerous states have legislated and mandated standard means of teacher evaluation as one method to improve teaching and student learning (Veir & Dagley, 2002).

According to Veir and Dagley (2002) from 1983 to 1985, only twenty states had legislation that dealt directly with teacher evaluation. By 1992, that number had risen to thirty-eight states with legislation pertaining to teacher evaluation. However, in 2000, forty-two states had statutory language regulating the evaluation of classroom teachers.

At the time of Veir and Dagley's review, teacher evaluation in Iowa was listed under School District Directors Powers and Duties, not as a state directed

or mandated requirement. While Veir and Dagley published their review in 2002, their actual review of state mandates must have been completed before May of 2001, as the standards and criteria under which Iowa's classroom teachers are evaluated have changed dramatically since the passage of legislation during 2001. For one to understand the current practices of teacher evaluation in Iowa it is critical to understand these changes in Iowa law and the resulting changes in teacher evaluation practices in Iowa school districts.

Teacher Evaluation in Iowa in 2003

A review of the current practices and requirements of the teacher evaluation processes in Iowa seems prudent before a comprehensive historical review of the literature on teacher evaluation is undertaken. This review will enable the reader to have the needed understanding of teacher evaluation in Iowa and why a study of this topic was needed. The following review of Iowa legislation and resulting Code of Iowa (Law) will provide the reader with an understanding of the 2003 teacher evaluation expectations in Iowa.

In 2001, the State of Iowa enacted several pieces of legislation pertaining to teacher evaluation. For example, the Iowa Senate passed Senate File 476 in (2001): *An Act Relating to the Establishment of a Student Achievement and Teacher Quality Program and Providing for Contingent Effectiveness.* The Iowa House of Representatives also adopted this focus as the representatives passed two related acts focusing on student achievement and teacher quality. Those acts were House File 413 (2001), *An Act Making an Appropriation for Purposes*

of the Student Achievement and Teacher Quality Program and Providing for Contingent Effectiveness, and House File 2549 (2001), *An Act Relating to Students and School District Employees by Amending the Student Achievement and Teacher Quality Program and Language Pertaining to Retirement Incentives and Providing an Effective Date.*

These acts resulted in the development of Section 284.1 through Section 284.13 of the Code of Iowa. These codes of law define the expectations and the requirements of the law as it relates to student achievement and teacher quality. The four major elements encompassed in Section 284 of Iowa code are listed below.

1. Mentoring and induction programs that provide support for beginning teachers in accordance with section 284.5.
2. Career paths with compensation levels that strengthen Iowa's ability to recruit and retain teachers.
3. Professional development designed to directly support best teaching practices.
4. Team-based variable pay that provides additional compensation when student performance improves.

Senate File 476: *An Act Relating To the Establishment of a Student Achievement and Teacher Quality Program and Providing for Contingent Effectiveness* clearly states in section 1, that the intent is to create a student achievement and teacher quality program that acknowledges that outstanding

teachers are a key component in student success. The goals of the program are to improve student achievement by ensuring teacher quality, and to redesign compensation methods and teacher professional development in Iowa schools.

To this end, the adopted legislation defines what the evaluation of effective teaching in the state of Iowa is to include. These state mandated teaching standards are to be included in all beginning teacher's performance evaluations. Senate File 476 and Iowa Code section 284.3, *Iowa Teaching Standards* clearly defines the following competencies for teacher quality through the eight Iowa teaching standards.

1. Demonstrates ability to enhance academic performance and support for and implementation of the school district's student achievement goals.
2. Demonstrates competence in content knowledge appropriated to the teaching position.
3. Demonstrates competence in planning and preparing for instruction.
4. Uses strategies to deliver instruction that meets the multiple learning needs of students.
5. Uses a variety of methods to monitor student learning.
6. Demonstrates competence in classroom management.
7. Engages in professional growth.
8. Fulfills professional responsibilities established by the school district.

In adopting these standards, representatives and senators in the Iowa Legislature believed that the above eight standards would better enable all Iowa school districts to improve student achievement and improve teacher quality. According to section 284.3 of the Code of Iowa, Iowa schools were to begin using these standards in the comprehensive evaluation of all beginning teachers starting July 1, 2002. School districts were further directed to implement, for the purposes of performance reviews of all other teachers than beginning teachers, evaluations that utilized at a minimum the eight Iowa standards by July 1, 2004.

Moreover, the code specifically states that individual school boards might negotiate with the certified bargaining unit to include additional standards and criteria that are not in conflict with eight standards.

While specific minimum standards and criteria were established, a specific or prescriptive model of the entire teacher evaluation process was not mandated by the legislation. Specifically, the code in section 284.4, subsection e, created the following directive for Iowa school districts:

> Adopt a teacher evaluation plan that, at a minimum, requires a performance review of teachers in the participating district at least once every three years based upon the Iowa teaching standards and individual career development plans and requires administrators to complete evaluator training in accordance with section 284.10.

The code further set forth the guidelines that all teacher performance reviews were to follow in the state of Iowa. In section 284.8 *Performance review requirements for teachers,* the code outlined the steps below:

1. A participating school district shall review a teacher's performance at least once every three years for the purposes of assisting teachers in making continuous improvement, documenting continued competence in the Iowa teaching standards, identifying teachers in need of improvement, or to determine whether the teacher's practice meets school district expectations for career advancement in accordance with section 284.7. The review shall include, at minimum, classroom observation of the teacher, the teacher's progress, and implementation of the teacher's individual career development plan; shall include supporting documentation from other evaluators, teachers, parents, and students; and may include video portfolios as evidence of teaching practices.
2. If a supervisor or an evaluator determines, at any time, as a result of a teacher's performance that the teacher is not meeting district expectations under the Iowa teaching standards specified in section 284.3, subsection 1, paragraphs "*a*" through "*g*," the model criteria for the Iowa teaching standards developed by the department in accordance with section 256.9, subsection 50, or any other standard or criteria established in the collective bargaining agreement, the evaluator

shall, at the direction of the teacher's supervisor, recommend to the district that the teacher participate in an intensive assistance program. The intensive assistance program and its implementation are not subject to negotiation or grievance procedures established pursuant to Chapter 20. By July 1, 2004, all school districts must be prepared to offer an intensive assistance program.

3. If a teacher is denied advancement to the career II or advanced teacher level based upon a performance review, the teacher may appeal the decision to an adjudicator under the process established under section 279.17. However, the decision of the adjudicator is final.

As stated in Chapter 1 of this dissertation, all evaluators in Iowa who evaluated first and second year teachers were to complete ten days of training to ensure that the requirements of the new laws and regulations were implemented fairly and accurately by July 1, 2002. In addition, the regulations required that all evaluators in the State of Iowa be trained for full implementation and use of the standards and criteria with all Iowa teachers by July 1, 2004. However, in June of 2003, Governor Vilsack signed into law House File 549. This bill delayed the implementation of the teacher evaluation performance reviews based on the new teaching standards and criteria for experienced teachers until the 2005-06 school year.

Evaluator training to enhance the evaluation process is not a new concept for school administrators or for Iowa school administrators in particular. It is a

commonly held belief that evaluator skills can be learned and specifically narrative writing skills can be improved with training (McGreal, 1990). Wilson and Wood (1996) assert that with training in classroom observation administrators can be trained to control the "human element" or personal opinions and bias that could enter the evaluation process. They maintain this type of training would make the school administrator the instructional leader in the school building.

Early training of Iowa administrators began in 1987 when the Iowa Board of Educational examiners established regulations for evaluator approval. All certified principals in Iowa were required to earn evaluator approval by July 1, 1990. This training was referred to as I-Lead training as the training was developed by Iowa Leadership in Educational Administration Development. The evaluator training was designed to encourage and promote evaluation methods that promoted teacher accountability and teacher growth.

Research conducted by Daniel Lawler (1992) and Jim Sweeney (1992) of Iowa State University studied the implementation effectiveness of the evaluator training Iowa principals received. Survey results from 619 teachers who had worked with the same principal for three years were analyzed for information about the success of the training. These teachers were selected through a stratified random sample of 1,000 teachers from 200 randomly selected Iowa schools. Principals of all randomly selected schools had participated in the evaluator training.

Results of the study indicated that the evaluation training had a positive effect on the evaluation procedures and on the evaluators (Sweeney, 1992).

In light of such research findings, legislation enacted since 2001 and the resulting legal codes have created statewide teaching standards and criteria. These Iowa teaching standards and criteria came about due to the belief that Iowa student achievement could be improved with improved identification and enhancement of teacher effectiveness in Iowa schools.

According to Schermer (2003), the development of the Iowa teaching standards and criteria was based on current research. Schermer interviewed Department of Education consultant, Jeff Berger. Berger stated that a statewide group worked in collaboration with Tom McGreal for four months to develop the 42 criteria used to describe the eight teaching standards.

The committee reviewed, Zemelman, Daniels, and Hyde (1998). *Best Practice: New Standards for Teaching and Learning in America's Schools;* Marzano, F.J., Pickering, D.J., and Pollock, J.E. (2001). *Classroom Instruction that Works: Research-bases Strategies for Increasing Student Achievement;* the National Board Standards; INTASC standards; teaching standards from four other states and Danielson, C. (1996). *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching.*

Danielson, in the forward to Krueger and Wilkinson (2002) commends Iowa on structuring the Iowa framework around standards and recognizing that Iowa educators are familiar with her *Framework for Teaching* (p. 3).

In summary, it is in this context of the current requirements and practices of teacher evaluation in the state of Iowa that this literature review will move to a discussion of the available literature on teacher evaluation and analyze why many believe there was and is a need to improve the teacher evaluation process in schools.

Historical Review of the Literature

Ellett and Teddlie (2003) have stated teacher evaluation in the early 1900's was defined by the moralistic and ethical perspectives of the time. Good teachers were viewed as fine members of the community who possessed high moral and ethical standards and were good role models for students. Therefore, teachers were evaluated on their personal characteristics rather than through any evaluation process using information about effective teaching and learning.

Danielson and McGreal (2000) stated that evaluation has evolved over the years. During the 1940's and 1950's, evaluation was still focused on teacher traits. The belief was that these traits were linked to effective instruction. During the 1960's and 1970's, teacher evaluation began to focus on "clinical supervision". Clinical supervision often included the use of observation instruments by evaluators to record data and observation notes from classroom visits.

School districts often developed a list of productive teaching techniques that had been identified by staff and educational researchers. These productive teaching techniques were then clarified through the listing of specifically defined

criterion and descriptors. Observation instruments were then developed that incorporated these teaching techniques, criteria and descriptors. During the classroom observation, evidence was gathered to document the occurrences of productive teaching techniques (Manatt & Stow, 1984).

Clinical supervision as summarized by Reavis (1976) and Glickman (2002) consisted of five sequential steps. The first step was the pre-conference with the teacher. During the conference, the supervisor and the teacher discussed the reason for the observation, the focus of the observation, the method and the form of the observation, time of the observation, and time of the post-conference. An additional purpose of the pre-conference was to develop rapport between the evaluator and the teacher.

The second step was the actual classroom observation. Descriptions of the actual events that occurred were recorded. The supervisor's role was to capture data and information from the classroom. Data could be recorded through extensive notes and the use of observational check sheets. Regardless, of the recording technique the evaluator recorded verbatim as many of the verbal interactions taking place in the classroom as possible.

The third step was the analysis and interpretation of the observation data and determining the conference approach. The supervisor reviewed the classroom and teacher data looking for repeated patterns or concerns. The data and any pattern information were analyzed based on the focus of the observation set in the pre-observation conference. The best interpersonal approach to use

with the teacher during the post-conference was determined following analysis of the observation data.

The fourth step was the post-conference with the teacher. During the post-conference, the supervisor discussed the analysis of the observation data with the teacher. The conference typically focused on the components of the effective teaching identified during the pre-conference. An improvement plan might be developed. This might be developed by the supervisor, be a shared responsibility, or done by the teacher.

The fifth step of the clinical supervision process was the critique and analysis of the previous four steps. The supervisor reviewed whether the format and the procedures used were appropriated or whether revisions might be needed for future evaluations. This review included reflection about whether the process facilitated improved teaching and teacher growth toward self-supervision.

The goal of clinical supervision is to provide focus and clarity to in-class supervision and to cause improvement in the quality of teaching taking place in the classroom. The supervisor was to give specific information to the teacher based on the gathered classroom data.

During the 1970's and 1980's, Madeline Hunter proposed a set of prescriptive teaching practices. These prescriptive teaching practices became know as the Hunter Model of Teaching (Hunter, 1985). The model focused on teacher-centered classrooms and on the premise that the teacher was a decision

maker. While Hunter did not design her model of teacher-centered classrooms to be used in an evaluative manner, many school districts and administrators used the Hunter model to evaluate teachers and teacher instruction. Administrators evaluated teachers based on the presence of characteristics of effective teaching found on Hunter's list. Many classroom observation tools used Hunter's list to identify effective instruction and therefore, incorporated Hunter's model into the evaluation process.

Hunter believed teaching was made up of a continual series of decisions made by the teacher, and that good teacher decisions increased the probability of learning. She proposed that a cause-effect relationship existed between teaching and student learning (Brandt, 1985). Hunter (1985) stated her model of teaching would improve teaching, but that it was not created to evaluate teachers.

> •*Myth: The model was created to evaluate teachers.* Not at all! It was created to increase teaching excellence. Using the model has changed many marginal teachers into effective ones and effective teaches into masters. An observer can pinpoint inappropriate teaching decisions and behaviors, then offer productive alternatives. Rather than general admonitions, ... the model equips observer and teacher with knowledge, skills, and the practical assistance to attain excellence. (p. 58)

Hunter was not alone in her belief on the importance of the narrowed focus on teaching. McGreal (1983) has stated that an effective evaluation system

would focus on and talk about teaching. He believed that effective school districts had narrowed the focus on teaching. Those districts had developed their perspectives and definitions about teaching. All staff had received training and all had a common understanding of the evaluation process that was implemented in their school district.

In his work on teacher evaluation, McGreal (1983) stated that there were four major tenets of classroom observation.

1. The reliability and usefulness of classroom observation is directly related to the amount and kind of information the supervisor obtains before hand. (p. 98)
2. The accuracy of the classroom observation is directly related to the supervisor's use of a narrow focus of observation. (p.102)
3. The way data are recorded directly affects the supervisor-teacher relationship and the teacher's willingness to participate in instructional improvement. (p. 105)
4. The way feedback is presented to the teacher directly affects the supervisor-teacher relationship and the teacher's willingness to participate in instructional improvement. (p.116)

McGreal believed observation was the dominant method for collecting information about teaching. While schools were looking at alternative methods, he believed that due to tradition and the practical and usually reliable nature of observation, it would continue to be the main method of data collection.

Additionally, he believed that no area of education held more potential impact on the improvement of school and instruction than a successful teacher evaluation system. He argued in 1983 that improved teacher evaluation was an idea whose time had come.

During the 1980's, Soar, Medley, and Coker (1983) argued that the current practice of teacher evaluation was inadequate. They stated teacher evaluation could be broken down into three types of evaluation.

1.) Tests teachers took which measured teacher characteristics.

2.) Student achievement scores a teacher's students received.

3.) Teacher performance ratings received in classroom observations.

Soar, Medley, and Coker stated these methods were failures and that state legislatures from across the country were mandating teacher evaluation methods due to this failure.

These same researchers, Medley, Coker, and Soar (1984), argued additional evidence for the need of improvement came from the numbers of incompetent teachers that were in schools and stayed until old age forced them to retire. In 1984, state legislatures across the country were in the process of defining valid teacher evaluation. The popular belief was the problems of public education could be connected to the apparent inability of teachers and school administrators to accurately determine which teachers were competent and which were incompetent.

In a study on the accuracy of principals' judgments about teacher effectiveness, Medley and Coker (1987) concluded that there was low accuracy of the typical principal's judgments of teacher performance. They reported that these findings were consistent with the findings of eleven earlier studies they had reviewed. Their review included the research of L. J. Lins (1946). *The Prediction of Teaching Efficiency,* D.M. Medley and H.E. Mitzel. (1959). *Some Behavioral Correlates of Teacher Effectiveness,* and H.O. Rugg (1922). *Is the Rating of Human Character Practicable?* Within the 1987 study, Medley and Coker used a four-way factorial design using 46 principals and 322 teachers.

The sample of teachers used was obtained by selecting the sample principals and then using only those teachers whose performance the principals were willing to judge. The independent variables of the study were student ability, subject tested, role judged, and the grade taught. Student achievement was determined by each district's pre and post assessments in reading and math. Regression equations were completed on each teacher's students to estimate gains.

The results of the study found principals felt the teachers in their school were far superior to teachers in other schools. Medley and Coker (1987) concluded that their research did not support the widely held belief that the principal was a good judge of teacher performance and that it was difficult to make objective and accurate observations. Additionally, they did not find

evidence to support that principals varied in their ability to judge teacher performance.

Research completed in the 1990's by Pamela Tucker supports Medley and Coker's assertion on principals' judgments of effective teaching. Tucker (1997) indicated there was a general belief that five to 15 percent of the public school teachers performed at incompetent levels and lacked the knowledge and skills necessary for effective teaching. She states these opinions are supported by a study of Virginia principals and the evaluation processes in place in Virginia schools. Tucker's study found a comprehensive evaluation process did not ensure the evaluator would address incompetent teaching. For example, one hundred twelve principals reported on a questionnaire/survey a teacher incompetence rate of five percent, but only 2.65 % of teachers were actually documented as have teaching competency concerns. In addition, Tucker found that 36 % of the principals reported no incompetent teachers were employed by their school.

In her assessment of the principals' evaluations, Tucker states, "It is unclear whether this absence of incompetent teachers is an accurate assessment of the manifestation of the Lake Wobegon Effect" (p.109). The Lake Wobegon Effect has been described as a condition in which most individuals or groups are above average. She reported that the study found the lack of any relationship between the evaluation process components and the administrative response to incompetent teachers. Tucker lamented the fact the findings

indicated that a comprehensive evaluation process did not ensure that a principal would address the issue of incompetence. She believed the results of the study indicated that further study of the evaluation process is needed and that specific studies of other variables that may affect administrative responses need to be completed.

During the 1980's, Bickers (1988) also stated many of the criticisms of public education focused on quality teaching. Bicker believed to meet public demand, school districts needed a comprehensive teacher evaluation system. He believed schools should ensure that all teachers were minimally competent. Furthermore, competent teachers should improve their skills and outstanding teachers should be identified and recognized. To meet these obligations he believed schools needed an evaluation system that included both formative and summative evaluation procedures.

Manning (1988) also believed formative and summative evaluation needed to replace the outdated system of checklists and numerical ratings used for teacher evaluations. He stated he thought formative observations that started early in the school year provided more opportunity for the improvement of teaching. Manning believed evaluation did more than give a summary of a teacher's performance. He believed good evaluation could enhance the following aspects of teaching:

1. Support a plan for instructional improvement.
2. Satisfy the public's need for accountability.

3. Provide a structured plan for growth.
4. Give security to the teaching environment.
5. Provide motivation for teachers.
6. Define the practice of teaching.
7. Serve as the basis for professional development. (p. 18)

Gitlin and Smyth (1989) have asserted that two paradigms were influencing the state of teacher evaluations in the late 1980's. The first paradigm was one of control and surveillance through hierarchical and bureaucratic methods. The second paradigm was that of a process of the development of educational relationships in which teachers, students and parent create self-knowledge. These two paradigms were contrasted by the beliefs of managerial relations of inspections and control, versus the educative relations of collegiality, reflection and empowerment.

As a result of a study on teacher evaluation, Wise and Darling-Hammond (1984), stated in their research summary that bureaucratic evaluation was sufficient for determining minimally performance but, not for determining higher levels of competence. They stated effective evaluation should be focused on more professionally orientated strategies for teacher improvement.

Wise and Darling-Hammond in their 1984 study conducted for the Rand Corporation drew the following conclusions.

1. A successful teacher evaluation system must suit the educational goals, management style, conception of teaching, and community values of the school district.
2. Philosophical commitment to and resources for evaluation produce more useful information than do checklists and procedures.
3. The school district should decide the main purpose of its teacher evaluation system and then match the process to the purpose.
4. To sustain resource commitments and political support, teacher evaluation must be seen to have utility, which in turn depends on the efficient use of resources to achieve reliability and cost-effectiveness.
5. Teacher involvement and responsibility improve the quality of teacher evaluation. (p. 29)

According to Ellett and Teddlie (2003), during the late 1980's a new effort and guidelines for teacher evaluation came from The National Board of Professional Teaching Standards when they developed and implemented a number of content specific, standards-based tasks for identifying and nationally certifying teachers displaying exemplary teaching based on a specific set of beliefs. Ellett and Teddlie stated that the NBPTS believed accomplished teachers displayed the following characteristics.

1. They are committed to students and their learning.
2. They know the subject they teach and how to teach those subjects to students.

3. They are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.
4. They think systematically about their practice and learn from experience.
5. They are members of learning communities. (p. 110)

According to Danielson and McGreal (2000), research on teaching during the 1990s focused on an expanded number of topics. These topics included critical thinking, content knowledge, content pedagogy, alternative assessment, multiple intelligences, collaborative learning, cognitive learning theory, constructivist classrooms, authentic pedagogy, engaged teaching and learning, and teaching for understanding. This list of numerous topics readily displays the complexities of effective teaching and teacher evaluation that were confronted during the 1990's.

A study completed by Searfoss and Enz (1996), was comprised of interviews of 20 female principals and 36 teachers from seven districts in Phoenix, Arizona. They wanted to determine principals' and teachers' perceptions about direct instruction instruments. Specifically, they investigated the participants' perceptions about fairness, validity, feedback, and self-reflection within the current evaluation methods.

Searfoss and Enz (1996) concluded principals did not want to change the direct instruction methods of evaluation. Principals stated the direct instruction methods were accurate and valid, while the teachers in the study stated they did

not believe the direct instruction methods of evaluation were valid measures of their teaching.

Searfoss and Enz (1996) argued the focus of teacher evaluation in the 1990's needed to move beyond the direct instruction evaluation methods to one in which administrators and teachers would work together to develop evaluation instruments and peer-involved evaluation methods which provided opportunity for self-reflection and professional growth.

Charlotte Danielson also believed in the importance of professional growth and the role it played in improved teaching and learning. Danielson (1996) in, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching* proposed a framework comprised of four domains and 22 components or descriptors. The four domains are planning and preparation, classroom environment, instruction, and professional responsibilities. The components define a distinct aspect of a domain. The components are further defined and clarified by the elements.

An example of Danielson's domains, components, and elements follows.

Domain 1: Planning and preparation.

Component 1a: Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy

Element: Knowledge of content (p.3)

Danielson stated her framework for teaching was based in part on the PRAXIS III criteria developed by Educational Testing Service. Danielson believed that the framework provided a common structure or organization for teaching.

The framework made it clear that the teacher's role encompassed activities that occur both in and out of the classroom. It also made all expectations clear and public while ensuring applicability to a wide range of instructional settings.

Because it addresses the complexities in a teaching act, the framework could function as a road map for beginning teachers, provide guidance for experienced teachers, a structure for focused improvement efforts, and tools for communication with the community.

The lengthy list of teaching topics from the 1990's is followed by a significantly shorter list put forth for the 2000's. Danielson and McGreal (2000) propose that authentic pedagogy, engaged teaching and learning, and teaching for understanding are the topics receiving the most emphasis during the past several years.

Quality Teacher Evaluation in the 21st Century

The contemporary belief that teacher evaluation should be connected to improved teaching and to student learning is offered by multiple educational researchers, (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Peterson, 2000; Stronge, 2002; and Iwanicki, 2001). For example, Stronge (2002) has argued that clinical supervision should be focused on the teacher's instructional skills to improve the teacher's instruction and improve student learning. He believed an improved method of clinical supervision would directly review what the students have learned.

Others believe there are specific reasons to complete teacher evaluations. Beerens (2000) has proposed that the three primary reasons to complete teacher evaluations are the following.

1. To improve teacher effectiveness.
2. To encourage professional growth.
3. To either remediate or eliminate weak teachers.

Danielson and McGreal (2000) and Danielson (2001) have proposed a structural framework for teacher evaluation that includes three differentiated tracks. These three tracks are "The Beginning Teacher Program Track," "The Professional Development Track," and "The Teacher Assistance Track."

The first track is designed for initial professional development and the beginning teacher. "The Beginning Teacher Program Track" is designed to ensure that the standards for effective teaching are understood and demonstrated. Second, the track provides support in the initial implementation of the teaching standards. Finally, the initial track provides accountability for the decision to continue employment as a teacher or the termination of the teacher contract.

Throughout the initial track, there are classroom observations with feedback, review of the teaching portfolio, discussion of professional practices and mentor support. During this initial track, there are many interaction between the beginning teacher and the administrator. These interactions are designed to ensure that the beginning teacher develops the desired effective teaching skills.

The second track focuses on professional growth. "The Professional Development Track" is designed for non-probationary or tenured teachers who demonstrate the standards of teacher effectiveness. The primary purposes of this track are to enhance professional growth, to improve student achievement, to provide comments on professional issues, and to focus on school improvement issues.

During this track, there is ongoing informal discussion of teacher performance and the development of a team and individual professional growth plans. There is collaboration between administrators, and teachers. Indicators of progress are developed and feedback with administrative support for teacher teams and teachers is provided.

The third track of the evaluation framework is the "The Teacher Assistance Track." This track is designed for teachers in need of specific professional guidance and development of specifically identified areas of the Standards for Effective Teaching. The purpose of this track is to give a tenured teacher the opportunity to seek assistance in any standard. Second, this track provides a more structured process for a tenured teacher who may benefit from more support. Third, this track will provide due process for a disciplinary action or termination. Observation and focused feedback on specifically identified improvement areas are a major component of this track.

Peterson (2000) believed there are twelve ways in which teacher evaluation should be modified. He stated the function of teacher evaluation is to

find, document, and acknowledge that good teaching exists. Moreover, good reasons to evaluate should be used. He stated one good reason to evaluate teachers included the reassurance to the public that defensible instruction is being completed in the classroom.

Petersen (2000) and Peterson, Wahlquist, Bone, Thompson, and Chatterton (2001), have also proposed the teacher should be the center of the evaluation process with multiple persons being used to judge teacher quality and performance. They further stated the administrator's judgmental role in teacher evaluation should be limited. They have proposed that a changed system would include multiple data sources to inform the judgments and decisions about teacher quality. These data sources could include student, and parent surveys, student achievement data, teacher tests, peer reviews, and professional logs of activities. Data sources may be variable to account for variations in teachers' effectiveness.

Data sources linked to teachers' affective characteristics also can be linked to effectiveness and perceptions of effectiveness in the classroom (Stronge, 2002). Effective teachers demonstrate they care about their students by listening to them, understanding them and knowing them. Caring teachers who know students create relationships that promote learning. Additionally, they create warm and supportive classrooms.

Stronge (2002) has further proposed effective social interactions with students involve the following behaviors.

1. Effective teachers consistently behave in a friendly and personal manner while maintaining appropriate teacher-student role structure.
2. Effective teachers work with students as opposed to doing things to or for them.
3. Productive interactions involve giving students responsibility and respect: also treating secondary students as adults when appropriate.
4. Teachers who are considered effective allow students to participate in decision-making.
5. Students indicated that effective teachers spend more time interacting and working directly with them than ineffective teachers.
6. When interacting with students, effective teachers demonstrate a sense of fun and a willingness to play or participate.
7. Effective teachers have a good sense of humor and are willing to share jokes. (p.17)

While Peterson has argued the role of the administrator should be limited, Wilson and Wood (1996), Protheroe (2002), Downey and Frase (2003), and Schmidt (2003) have argued that the building administrators should do teacher observations frequently. They have argued that principals need to understand student learning, know what good teaching looks like and be able to communicate and provide constructive feedback to the teacher. Frequent classroom visits enable the principal to gather data about the teaching environment. Furthermore, multiple observations provide for more detail and less

generalization of the teacher's skills as not all effective teaching behaviors and skill can be seen in a single classroom observation. Additionally, teacher observations not only provide information about the teacher's current competence, but also assist in continually improving teacher effectiveness and teacher performance.

In their work, *Leading Learning Communities: Standards for What Principals Should Know and Be Able To Do*, the National Association of Elementary School Principals (2001) proposed that effective principals spend large portions of their day in classrooms, observing teaching and providing detailed feedback regarding how teachers' effectiveness can be improved. The emphasis should be on what the teacher is doing correctly, not only on what is wrong. The goal is to ensure that all students are actively engaged in learning.

Teacher feedback from frequent observations should move beyond a checklists and rating scales (McGreal, 1990), to ongoing dialogue and plans for teachers' professional growth. Feedback from the principal should assist the teachers and help them grow professionally. Iwanicki (2001) has also argued teacher evaluation was most effective when teaching was analyzed based on what students were learning as related to an integrated professional development, or professional growth plan. He proposed that teacher evaluation should be linked with school improvement efforts. Furthermore, Iwanicki stated if school improvements were supported with quality professional development that

was linked with teacher evaluation, then meaningful improvements in teaching and student learning would result.

Professional Growth

Professional growth of teachers is a topic that has a history of being directly connected to teacher evaluation. From the review of literature, the topic of professional growth was evident throughout the literature on teacher effectiveness and teacher evaluation. In 1988, Stiggins and Duke proposed that teacher evaluation was the key to school improvement, and that effective teacher evaluation would maximize the chances that teachers would grow professionally. They stated evaluation could assist each individual teacher in becoming a better teacher. They believed a growth focused teacher evaluation process offered the potential of greater improvement within schools due to direct teacher involvement and ownership in the growth process.

Others, including Manning (1988) and Hunter (1998), also suggested that teacher professional development training be derived from teacher evaluation. Manning believed that professional development should not be treated as a separate entity, but rather it should be related to teaching improvement. He stated that the professional development program should address teacher evaluation results.

Hunter stated that a prerequisite to achieve a valid teacher evaluation process was a long-range, research-based professional development program. Hunter believed that leadership was needed to promote the professional

development program and that adequate resources of time and money needed to be provided. She stated evaluation needed to measure the results of professional development in terms of performance behavior. Additionally, teachers needed in-service, coaching, and time to acquire, develop and incorporate new skills into the classroom.

Beerens (2000) and Protheroe (2002) also supported the premise that professional development can and should be linked to teacher evaluation. They supported the notion that teachers should construct their own knowledge, and work collaboratively in creating knowledge about learning and teaching. Teachers needed to be trained to be reflective and to self assess their teaching.

Peer coaching is a specific professional development improvement technique that is recommended by many current educational experts (Beerens, 2000; Brandt, 1985; Costa & Garmston, 1994; Danielson, 1996; Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Hunter, in Stanley & Popham, 1988). Peer coaching can take several forms but primarily includes teacher peers observing each other and forming supportive groups for study and teacher improvement. The dialogue following peer observations should lead to deeper professional dialogue about the peer teachers' instructional practices and student learning.

To contribute to this type of support, Costa and Garmston (1994) have created a peer coaching model called Cognitive Coaching which consists of the coach and teacher meeting in a planning conference prior to the classroom observation to review the lesson objectives, discuss teaching strategies,

determine the evidence of student learning, and identify the focus of the data gathering. The planning conference is also a trust-building opportunity. Costa and Garmsten believe that a base of trust is needed before any professional learning can take place.

During the classroom observation the peer coach gathers data on which the teacher wants feedback. This could be data about student understanding and achievement on classroom goals. Additionally, the coach/observer gathers data on the teacher's strategies and decisions throughout the lesson. The coach/observer may utilize a number of data-collection techniques including taping, observation notes, movement mapping, and frequency counts of student contact.

Following the classroom observation, the coach/observer facilitates a reflective conference by having the teacher review his/her impressions and assessments of the lesson, review data supporting those impressions and assessments, compare the planned lesson to the actual lesson, and analyze the connection between student learning and teacher decisions. The final step is the synthesis of teacher learning and the reflection about the actual peer coaching process.

An additional component that many educators believe should be part of the evaluative process is the collection of multiple data sources and artifacts linked to the teacher's professional growth and the teacher's effectiveness. Manatt and Kemis (1997) have proposed that data sources could come from

360° feedback, or anyone who had contact with the teacher, including the principal, parents, students, and other teachers. These multiple data sources could be stored in data set files or in a teacher portfolio (Danielson, 2001; Painter, 2001; Peterson, Wahlquist, Bone, Thompson, & Chatterton, 2001; Tucker, Stronge, & Gareis, 2002; Tucker, Stronge, Gareis, & Beers, 2003).

With so much teaching and instructional data available, how does one determine how much is needed? Peterson, Wahlquist, Bone, Thompson, and Chatterton (2001) have argued that the use of data sets that are limited in size is the best method of compiling information from multiple data sources. They believed that a portfolio could become too large and awkward. They argued that a data set containing a minimum number of data sources is less time-consuming to develop and review than a portfolio.

Others believe that teachers should collect and place in their teaching portfolio evidence and artifacts from their teaching and professional training. This provides multiple data sources to use in addition to the traditional classroom observation. Tucker, Stronge, and Gareis (2002) have argued that the uses of a teacher portfolio will expand the performance portrait, enhance the validity of the evaluation, increase the reliability of the evaluation, and provide improved goal attainment by the teacher. They believed including portfolio information in the evaluation process would promote a deeper and more accurate assessment of the teacher's performance.

Additionally, Tucker, Stronge, and Gareis (2002) believed that through self-reflection of the teacher reviewing his/her portfolio, an improved evaluation would take place. This improved evaluation should assist in the development of an individualized professional development plan that promotes the growth of the individual teacher.

Tucker, Stronge, Gareis, and Beers (2003) have stated their study on the efficacy of using portfolios for teacher evaluation and professional development confirmed the need to use portfolios as one major source of information in a multiple data source system of teacher evaluation. They have proposed that the use of portfolios complemented the data collected through classroom observations and conferences and better captured the complexity of teaching than a single data collection technique. In addition, Tucker, Stronge, Gareis, and Beers stated portfolios enabled teachers to improve their use of self-evaluation and enhanced teacher professionalism. These researchers stated in the conclusion of their research study:

> Despite the reservations about the time required to develop portfolios, we continue to be enthusiastic about their usefulness, because it is clear that they can provide a broader and richer portrayal of teacher performance than classroom observations alone – a traditional but much maligned approach to teacher evaluation. Portfolios expand the lens on the work of teachers for the purposes of accountability and offer a possible avenue for

meaningful professional development—the two touchstones of teacher evaluation. (p. 594)

The portfolio itself is not part of the professional development plan because it is not evaluated. However, the contents do accommodate multiple data sources and provide for a fuller and more accurate evaluation of the teacher. Painter (2001) stated the portfolio should never be the only method of staff development or replace teacher evaluation observations, rather the portfolio complements other practices and provides the teacher with a tool to self-evaluate his/her teaching and professional growth while striving to improve his/her teaching.

This fuller and more accurate evaluation of the teacher should lead to improved reliability and validity of the teacher evaluation process. The reliability of the process should be enhanced by the fact that regardless of the evaluator the teacher's self-reflection and self-evaluation plays an important role in the development and stability of the professional improvement plan. Reliability of the evaluation is an important component of a fair process, as regardless of who the evaluator is the evaluation conclusions should be consistently the same. Validity of the evaluation is a critical component of fair and accurate assessment of the teacher effectiveness.

Valid teacher evaluation

In answering the question, "What is a valid teacher evaluation system?" Peterson (2000) believed that validation involved the development of a public description that showed the system actually assessed what it claimed to assess.

In addition, Peterson has proposed that the attributes of a valid evaluation system include a system that has good reasons behind the system and does not have good reasons against it. A valid evaluation system also is one that is agreed on by experts in the field as well as local practitioners. The system documents what it says it documents and the documentation is accurate, consistent, predictable, and dependable across evaluations. Cruickshank and Haefele (2001) emphasize this point by stating that the evaluation process must use valid criteria that are related to the standards the teacher is striving to achieve.

According to Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, and Bernstein (1984), a valid system depends on the accuracy and comprehensiveness of the teacher evaluation process. The stated validity of the process is dependent on the evaluation criteria, the data collection process, and the competence of the evaluator. The entire evaluation process must be matched to the evaluation purpose to be valid.

Validation is also evident when the system incorporates best practices. For a teacher evaluation system to be valid, one needs to focus on what happens before the evaluation. Programs of in-service, coaching and formative evaluation

all contribute to making a summative evaluation valid and reliable (Hunter, 1988). Furthermore, a valid evaluation process would be one which the evaluators receive training in the evaluation process to help ensure objectivity, reliability, and consistent outcomes across evaluators (Cruickshank & Haefele, 2001).

Bradshaw (2002) stated higher levels of validation could be attained over time, after the implementation of a new evaluation process. He said as the new system was monitored and refined and as evaluators and teachers became more skilled with the evaluation system, the result would become more reliable. Over time and use, higher levels of confidence about the system's validity could be attained. This validity would be evidenced by the fact, that the teacher evaluation system evaluated what it was designed to evaluate, operated fairly, accomplished the goals of the evaluations system, and supported the goals of the school district. Bradshaw further proposed that evaluation validity went beyond not only the specific criteria or content of the evaluation instrument, but also to the impact of the evaluation process or system on the school organization as a whole.

Finally, Tucker, Stronge, and Gareis (2002) have argued that the use of multiple data sources found in portfolios increases evaluation validity. They believe that these multiple sources used with classroom observations improves the accuracy of the evaluation. They state:

> Enhanced validity: The information used in making decisions about teachers should be a valid measure of *actual* job performance and, thus,

> should include information on all major dimensions of the job. By collecting information with portfolios and other forms of data, in conjunction with classroom observations, we can greatly enhance the accuracy and thoroughness of teacher evaluation. (p. 6)

They believe a portfolio could display artifacts about preparation and planning, assessment of student achievement, communications with students, parents and the community, and examples of professional responsibilities. They profess that these data sources would lead to a more accurate and valid evaluation of the teacher.

Tucker, Stronge, Gareis, and Beers (2003) have asserted their study reaffirmed the validity of portfolios as they found 90% of the artifacts in the reviewed portfolios were valid representations of the teacher's responsibilities. They found that teachers' portfolios on average contained 24 valid artifacts to demonstrate their professional responsibilities.

Summary

The observation and evaluation of teachers is an extensive time consuming process that school principals, superintendents and other evaluators are required by state law and master contract guidelines to complete each year with all or part of their teaching staff.

Whether an evaluation process was developed in the 1970's, the 1980's or has just been recently developed, validity of the results is a critical concern for both the teacher and the evaluator. Teacher evaluation results and conclusions

lead to employment-related decisions including but not limited to hiring, career advancements, promotions, salary increases, and in some situations termination of the teacher's contract and teaching license. While these decisions are important to teachers, many individuals believe the primary reason for a valid evaluation process is to ensure a quality learning experience for all students.

If one believes, as the Iowa Legislature recently expressed through the passage of legislation and resulting legal codes mandating the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria, that improved teaching will lead to improved student learning, then one needs to have a high degree of confidence that the process of teacher evaluation in place is highly valid and reliable. As stated in the first paragraph of this proposal, the school's mission is to educate students; therefore, the effectiveness of teachers' performance is an important component of the educational process. To ensure the effectiveness of teachers' performance and quality student instruction school administrators are required to evaluate teachers fairly and consistently.

This literature review was designed to give the reader an historical context aid in the development of a basic understanding of the issues encompassed in the teacher evaluation process. The primary issues focused on in this literature are the identification of teacher effectiveness, the development of teacher evaluation instruments, the various methods and techniques in completing a teacher evaluation, professional growth of the teacher and how to ensure that the evaluation process is fair, consistent and valid.

As stated in Chapter 1, the purpose of this study was to provide Iowa educators, organizations such as School Administrators of Iowa, the Department of Education, Iowa Association of School Boards, and the Iowa Legislature with implementation information from Iowa administrators about the perceived effectiveness and validity of the new evaluation processes developed to incorporate the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria in identifying teacher effectiveness. Iowa's citizens, educators, School Administrators of Iowa, the Department of Education, and the Iowa Legislature need relevant and accurate data to determine if the standards and criteria are being implemented, and if after one and one-half years, are making a perceived difference in identifying teacher effectiveness as demonstrated by teachers in Iowa classrooms.

Chapter 3

METHOD

The study was based on an electronically mailed web-based survey to gather data on the current perceptions of Iowa public school administrators on the implementation and use of the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria in the evaluation of beginning teachers in Iowa.

The survey was electronically sent to a select group of principals and superintendents in the state of Iowa. These 333 Iowa administrators were randomly selected from a list of Iowa administrators identified as having had first and second year teachers employed in their school district.

The researcher gathered and analyzed data on the identification of teacher effectiveness and teacher evaluation to address the following research questions.

Research Questions

The major research questions to be addressed were:

1. What are the perceptions of Iowa administrators about the implementation of the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria for identifying teacher effectiveness of first and second year teachers?
2. Do Iowa administrators believe that the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria can better identity teacher effectiveness of first and second year teachers than previously used processes?

3. What are the perceptions of Iowa administrators about the pending implementation of the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria for identifying teacher effectiveness of experienced teachers by July 1, 2005?

These three research questions were the basis for this research study and lead to the following research hypothesis.

Statement of Hypothesis

There are no perceived differences between the effectiveness of the past evaluation systems and processes of Iowa school districts and the effectiveness of the new systems and processes using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria in identifying teacher effectiveness.

Procedures

The principals and superintendents who were asked to respond were randomly selected from all Iowa school districts which were known to have had first and second year teachers during the 2002-2003 and/or during the 2003-2004 school year. This listing of schools with first and/or second year teachers was obtained from the Iowa Department of Education's website.

Of the 371 public school districts in the state of Iowa during the 2002-2003, 359 employed first and/or second year teachers. The information obtained from the Iowa Department of Education further identified the 1001 specific school sites where a full time first and/or second year teacher taught. Of those 1001

school sites, eight sites were identified as district-wide teacher sites and did not have teachers linked to specific school sites with identified administrators.

The information obtained from the Iowa Department of Education showed that 96.8 percent of all public school districts employed a first and/or second year teacher and 65.9 percent of all school attendance centers contained a first and/or second year teacher during the 2002-2003 school year. From this group of schools 333 school administrators were randomly selected for inclusion in the study. School district and building data for the 2003-2004 school year will not be available for release until February or March of 2004. Therefore, the survey focused on school administrators known to have evaluated first and second year teachers during the 2002-2003 school year.

To verify the Iowa Department of Education's data, items were included on the survey instrument to verify that the administrator did, in fact, evaluate a first or second year teacher. If an administrator did not directly evaluate a first or second year teacher, they were asked to skip to the end of the survey and to not complete the survey. This verification also sought to ensure that each evaluator was aware of the evaluation standards and criteria that are to be used to evaluate these first and second year teachers.

Data were collected through an electronically-mailed survey instrument with an electronic cover letter to each of the selected school administrators. Administrators were asked to respond to implementation questions on a five point Liker scale and on five open response questions.

The survey instrument was initially piloted during October 2003, through its review by four practicing Iowa public school administrators who have had the state mandated Evaluator Training classes and who have evaluated first and/or second year teachers. Following this initial pilot, revisions were completed and the survey instrument was again piloted through administration to Drake University graduate students in the Educational Leadership Doctoral Cohort during the first two weeks of November 2003. These Doctoral candidates are practicing school administrators and evaluators who possess a current working knowledge of the teacher evaluation systems and processes in their school districts. Input from the pilot run was utilized to make additional modifications and refinements to the survey instrument before its administration to the selected Iowa administrators in December 2003 and January 2004.

The survey has two main focus areas:

1. Demographic and descriptive data questions.
2. Specific perceptions and beliefs about the implementation and effect of the teaching standards and criteria on the evaluation process and the identification of teacher effectiveness in beginning teachers.

It was the assumption of this researcher, as a school administrator, that December was a relatively good month to request survey responses from public school administrators. An introduction letter was mailed to the selected administrators on December 10, 2003, informing them of the study and that they would receive an email with a web based survey website address in

approximately one week. On December 17, 2003, an email describing the study and requesting their involvement in the study was sent to each of the 333 randomly selected administrators. Incorrect email addresses were identified for 29 administrators following the initial mailing. Seeking out school websites or calling the administrators with email error messages corrected these incorrect addresses and the initial request was resent to those selected administrators who did not receive the initial email.

A follow up email reminder to complete the survey questionnaire was sent on January 5, 2004 to all administrators who had not responded to the survey. A third request was emailed to all non-respondents on January 12, 2004. As a result of the mailing and the three email requests, 228 of the 333 randomly selected administrators completed the survey. This resulted in a 68.5% return rate. The survey website at SurveyMonkey.com containing the survey questionnaire was active for one month from December 17, 2003 through January 17, 2004.

A copy of the initial introduction letter, which was mailed to each selected administrator, is found in Appendix B. A copy of the email cover letter for the actual electronic survey is found in Appendix C. The mailed letter of introduction and the cover letter both contained information clarifying each respondent's consent to provide information for the study. Each respondent's consent to be included in the study was assumed as affirmative by the respondent going to the web site's http address, logging on, and completing the survey instrument.

Additionally, each respondent may receive a copy of the study's results upon request. A copy of the actual survey questionnaire instrument is found in Appendix D.

Data Analysis

Data analysis began with the final return of all survey responses and when this researcher made the determination on January 17, 2004, that, no additional surveys would be forthcoming. Detailed raw data and summary data was downloaded from the SurveyMonkey.com web site. These data were imported into Excel spreadsheets for analysis.

Initial data analysis consisted of descriptive statistical analysis. Descriptive analysis with a report of the demographic data of the respondents was completed. The mean, mode, and standard deviation for each Likert item response were also computed. Finally, qualitative analysis of the responses to the open ended items were compiled and coded. Patterns from the responses were identified with common responses reported. Description of the open-ended responses included direct quotes to add to the clarity and richness of the description.

Inferential statistical analysis examined the relationships between administrators' perceptions from the subgroups of; grade levels supervised, years of administrative experience, and school size about the implementation of the teaching standards and criteria. The statistical process of Analysis of Variance ANOVA was utilized to determine if there were any significant

differences between the means of the subgroups of grade levels supervised, years of administrative experience, and school size on the items designed to gather administrators perceptions about the Standards and Criteria and the ten-day evaluator training.

Findings and results of this analysis are found in Chapter 4. In addition, Chapter 4 contains the descriptive data and a qualitative analysis of the open response items on the questionnaire.

Chapter 4

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

This chapter provides an analysis of the data derived from the completed web-based questionnaire that surveyed three hundred thirty-three Iowa Public School Administrators reported to have evaluated first and/or second year teachers. Of the three hundred thirty-three randomly selected administrators who received the survey, two hundred twenty-eight Iowa Public School Administrators completed the questionnaire. While 228 administrators logged on to complete the questionnaire, no single item received 228 responses. This may reflect an error of operation by the respondent or a conscious choice by the respondent to skip an item. A copy of the questionnaire can be found in Appendix D.

The data will be presented and interpreted in three major sections, with the first section emphasizing descriptive statistics, the second section inferential statistics, and the third section focusing on qualitative analysis of the open ended questions. The following research questions and hypothesis provide the framework for these sections.

Research Questions

The major research questions to be addressed follow:

1. What are the perceptions of Iowa administrators about the implementation of the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria for identifying teacher effectiveness of first and second year teachers?
2. Do Iowa administrators believe that the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria can better identity teacher effectiveness of first and second year teachers than previously used processes?
3. What are the perceptions of Iowa administrators about the pending implementation of the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria for identifying teacher effectiveness of experienced teachers by July 1, 2005?

These three research questions were the basis for this research study and lead to the following research hypothesis.

Statement of Hypothesis

There are no perceived differences between the effectiveness of the past evaluation systems and processes of Iowa school districts and the effectiveness of the new systems and processes using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria in identifying teacher effectiveness.

Descriptive Data Analysis

Administrators Completed the Required Ten Day Iowa Evaluator Training

Of the 228 respondents, 225 responded to the question designed to ascertain if they had completed the required ten days Iowa Evaluator Training. All 225 or 100% of the administrators responding to the item had completed the

required ten days of training. There was no attempt made to differentiate between the four days of Data Driven Leadership Training and the six days of Evaluation Training.

Employed and Evaluated a First and or Second Year Teacher

Two hundred twenty-seven administrators responded to the item designed to determine if there was indeed a first or second year teacher in their school building as reported by the Iowa Department of Education. Two hundred twenty-two or 97.8% of administrators replied they had employed and evaluated a first or second year teacher. Five administrators or 2.2% replied that there was not a first or second year teacher in their school during either the 2002-2003 or the 2003-2004 school year.

One hundred sixty-eight administrators or 74.3% stated they had evaluated at least one first or second year teacher during both the 2002-2003 and 2003-2004 school year. Forty-nine administrators reported they had evaluated either a first or second year teacher during the 2002-2003 or the 2003-2004 school year. Nine administrators reported that they had not evaluated a first or second year teacher either school year. They were asked to not complete any items beyond item 7 and submit their survey.

Of the administrators reporting they had evaluated a first or second year teacher, a total 784 first or second year teachers were reported as evaluated. From the 784 first and second year teachers evaluated, 14 administrators identified 18 teachers as being sub par or incompetent. This meant that 6.14% of

administrators identified sub par teacher effectiveness in 2.3% of first and second year teachers.

Administrative Level of Respondents

Table 1 below reports data about the administrative level of the respondents. Elementary administrators made up 46% of all respondents with Superintendent/Central Office administrators making up only 3.1% of all respondents. Totals equal more than 100% and 228 respondents as a number of administrators supervise multiple grade spans, and therefore, marked multiple levels.

Table 1

Level of Administrator	Response Percent	Response Total
Elementary	46.0%	104
Middle Level	30.1%	68
High School	37.2%	84
Superintendent	3.1%	7

Administrative Experience of Respondents

Table 2 reports the administrative experience of the respondents. Five ranges of administrative experience were utilized. These ranges were divided into bands of four years of administrative experience.

Table 2

Administrative Experience of Respondents

Years of Administrative Experience	Response Percent	Response Total
0-3 years	12.4%	28
4-7 years	17.7%	40
8-11 years	25.7%	58
12-15 years	17.7%	40
16 + years	26.5%	60
	100.0%	226

The distributions of administrative experience ranged from a low of 12.4% respondents with 0-3 years experience to a high of 26.5% of respondents with 16 or more years of administrative experience. Eighty-seven and six tenths percent of all respondents had four or more years of administrative experience.

School District Size Classification (Iowa High School Boys Basketball Athletic Classification)

Table 3 displays the four-classification size of administrator's school districts. These classifications are identified by these four size groups with 1-A signifying small schools through 4-A signifying large schools.

Table 3

School District Size Classification (Iowa High School Boys Basketball classification)

Classification Size	Response Percent	Response Total
1-A	28.6%	64
2-A	19.2%	43
3-A	25.4%	57
4-A	26.8%	60
		224

Distribution of administrators ranged from a high of 28.6% of respondents from 1-A schools to a low of 19.2% from 2-A schools. Each school size classification had more than 40 respondents; therefore, ANOVA's were completed on the means of each subgroup. The significant variances between groups are reported in the inferential statistics section of this chapter.

Area Education Agency of Each Administrator

Table four reports in which Area Education Agency (AEA) each administrator was located. The percentages do not total 100% due to rounding. Four AEA's had less than ten administrators selected for the study. Only five AEA's had more than 20 administrators selected.

Table 4

Area Education Agency (AEA)

Area Education Agency	Response Percent	Response Total
AEA 1	7.1%	16
AEA 267	10.7%	24
AEA 4	1.3%	3
AEA 8	11.1%	25
AEA 9	10.7%	24
AEA 10	12.5%	28
AEA 11	21.9%	49
AEA 12	3.6%	8
AEA 13	7.1%	16
AEA 14	3.6%	8
AEA 15	7.6%	17
AEA 16	2.7%	6
		224

Area Education Agency 11 located in central Iowa had the most respondents with 49 or 21.9%. AEA 11 is one of the largest agencies in terms of the number students served and the number of administrators located within its boundaries. Area Education Agency 4, one of Iowa's smallest agencies, had the smallest number of selected administrators with 3 respondents, or 1.3% of the total respondents. Due to the small number of respondents from a number of AEA's inferential statistics to compare variance between their means was not completed. Seven of the AEA's had fewer than 20 respondents; with four AEA's having fewer than 10 respondents.

Number of First and/or Second Year Teachers Evaluated

Table 5 shows the number of first and or second year teacher evaluated by the selected Iowa administrators. The range varied from a high of 13 first and second year teachers evaluated by an administrator, to a low of one teacher evaluated. The largest category was administrators who had evaluated two first or second year teachers. This group accounted for 23% of the total respondents.

Table 5

Number of First and/or Second Year Teachers Evaluated

Number of Teachers Evaluated	Response Percent	Response Total	Number of Teachers
1	14.3%	31	31
2	23.0%	50	100
3	19.8%	43	129
4	14.3%	31	124
5	14.3%	31	155
6	3.7%	8	48
7	5.1%	11	77
8	0.9%	2	16
9	1.8%	4	36
10	0.9%	2	20
11	0.5%	1	11
12	0.9%	2	24
13	0.5%	1	13
	100%	217	784

Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria

In describing the administrator's perceptions about the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria, the following perceptual data was found. Table 6 provides the means and standard deviations about important administrators' perceptions, which are related to the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria.

Table 6

Administrator Ratings and Standard Deviations of Important Perceptions about the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria

Perception Description	Mean	SD
The Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria has improved my school's teacher evaluation process.	3.72	0.97
The Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria has improved teacher evaluation in Iowa.	3.56	0.94
Incorporating the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria has increased the time I spend in completing teacher evaluation.	4.49	0.78
Beginning teacher instruction has improved as a result of using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria.	3.70	0.87
Classroom instruction in Iowa will improve as a result of using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria.	3.61	0.87
My district will be ready to implement he Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria with all teachers by July 1, 2005.	4.14	0.73
My district has already implemented a process using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria with all staff.	3.10	1.34
Student achievement in my district will improve as a result of implementing the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria.	3.20	0.89
Student achievement in Iowa improve as a result of implementing the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria.	3.25	0.90

The mean is based on the use of a five point Likert scale on the questionnaire. A response of one being strongly disagrees with the statement,

through a five meaning strongly agrees. Sixty-eight percent of responding Iowa administrators agreed or strongly agreed that the incorporation of the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria for teacher evaluation has improved their school's teacher evaluation process. Only 14% disagreed or strongly disagreed that the incorporation of the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria for teacher evaluation did not improve their school's teacher evaluation process.

While 68% of administrators believe their school's teacher evaluation process has improved, only 58% believe mandating statewide teacher evaluation standards and criteria has improved teacher evaluation in Iowa. Thirteen percent disagreed or strongly disagreed that mandating statewide evaluation standards and criteria has improved teacher evaluation in Iowa, with 28% of responding administrators undecided as to the statewide impact.

Eighty-six percent of administrators believe their district will be ready to implement the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria with all teachers by July 1, 2005. Only 47% of administrators reported their district has already implement a process using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria with all teaching staff.

Only 39% of the selected Iowa administrators expect student achievement to improve in their school because of implementing the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria in their school school's evaluation process. Twenty percent disagreed or strongly disagreed student achievement in their school will improve because of implementing the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria. Forty-one percent of reporting administrators remained undecided as to the impact the

incorporation of the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria would have on student achievement in their school.

Forty-one percent of administrators expect student achievement in Iowa to improve as result of implementing the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria into the teacher evaluation processes across the state. Eighteen percent disagree or strongly disagree student achievement in Iowa will improve, with 41% undecided as to the impact the incorporation of the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria will have on student achievement in Iowa schools.

Increased Administrator Time Spent on Teacher Evaluation

The highest ranked perception about the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria was the following descriptor: Incorporating the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria has increased the time I spend in completing teacher evaluation. Ninety-three percent of administrators reported they were spending increased time on teacher evaluation. Only 14 administrators reported they were spending approximately the same amount of time on teacher evaluation.

In Table 7 below the perceived amount of increased evaluation time is reported. The six ranges of time spent in teacher evaluation were broken down from less time up to 100% more time than in past years.

Table 7

Increased Administrator Time Spent on Teacher Evaluation

Amount of time spent In teacher evaluation	Response Percent	Response Total
Less time	0.5%	1
Same amount of time	6.5%	14
25% more time	28.2%	61
50% more time	38.4%	83
75% more time	15.7%	34
100% more time	10.6%	23
	100.0%	216

Training and Staff Development

The following data describe administrator perceptions concerning the administrative evaluation training they have received. In addition, information about administrators' perceptions on the need for training and staff development about the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria is also reported in this section. The questionnaire asked not only about the perceived need for additional administrator training and staff development but also about the perceived need for additional teacher training and staff development.

Table 8

Administrator Ratings and Standard Deviations of Important Perceptions about Training and Staff Development

Perception Description	Mean	SD
Having completed the ten-day evaluator training, I am better able to identify effective teaching.	3.04	1.04
Additional state support is needed to effectively implement the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria.	3.44	1.13
Additional administrator training about identifying effective teacher effectiveness is needed.	2.74	1.04
Additional administrator training about teacher evaluation using the Iowa Teaching Standards and criteria is needed.	2.66	1.03
Additional teacher training about identifying teacher effectiveness is needed.	3.62	0.95
Additional teacher training about teacher evaluation using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria is needed.	3.55	0.99

Forty-four percent of administrators agreed or strongly agreed they were better able to identify effective teaching following the ten-day training. Thirty-eight percent of administrators disagreed or strongly disagreed they were better able to identify effective teaching then before the ten-day training.

Fifty-four percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed additional state support is needed to effectively implement the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria into their district's teacher evaluation process. Twenty-seven percent of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed additional state support is needed to effectively implement the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria.

Of responding administrators, 27% agreed or strongly agreed additional administrator training about teacher evaluation using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria is needed, while 52% disagreed or strongly disagreed additional training was needed.

While administrators did not believe additional administrative training was needed, they did believe additional teacher training was needed. Sixty-seven percent of administrators agreed or strongly agreed additional teacher training about identifying teacher effectiveness was needed. Furthermore, 63% of responding administrators agreed or strongly agreed additional teacher training about teacher evaluation using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria was needed. The theme of increased teacher professional development will also be discussed in the analysis of the open-end responses in section three of this chapter.

Inferential Statistical Analysis

When comparing the means between subgroups the statistical process of ANOVA was used. Three subgroup variations were studied to determine if there was a significant difference of means between the subgroups. The three variations of subgroups studied were the grade level of administrative supervision, years of administrative experience, and school district size. The following tables display the difference of means between the subgroups found to be significant at or below the 0.05 level.

Administrative Grade Levels Supervised

Analysis of the variance of means in a One-Way ANOVA between administrative levels supervised found only one questionnaire item to have a significant difference of means at the 0.05 level. The item was number 24: Additional administrator training about teacher evaluation using the Iowa Teaching Standards and criteria is needed. While all three subgroups displayed means showing disagreement with the item, Elementary Administrators had a mean of 2.510 while Middle Level Administrators had a mean of 2.906.

Table 9 below shows the summary mean data and the ANOVA data for the item. A table showing the subgroup summary mean data and ANOVA data for all questionnaire items analyzed can be found in Appendix E of this dissertation.

Table 9

Additional Administrator Training about Teacher Evaluation Using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria is Needed.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
Elementary	100	251	2.510	0.959	0.980	0.098
Middle School	64	186	2.906	0.943	0.971	0.121
High School	80	223	2.788	1.182	1.087	0.122

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	F	***P-value***	*F crit*
Between Groups	6.939	2	3.470	3.374	**0.036**	3.033
Within Groups	247.815	241	1.028			
Total	254.754	243				

Years of Administrative Experience

Analysis of the variance of means in a One-Way ANOVA by subgroups based on years of administrative experience identified two items that were significant at or below the 0.05 level. The first item was questionnaire Item 11: I believe that incorporating the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria for teacher evaluation has improved my school's teacher evaluation process. The subgroup of administrators with 0-3 years of experience had a mean of 4.000, while the subgroup of administrators with 16+ years of experience had a mean of 3.386. The summary data and the ANOVA analysis can be found in Table 10 below.

Table 10

I Believe that Incorporating the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria for Teacher Evaluation has Improved my School's Teacher Evaluation Process.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
0-3 Years	28	112	4.000	0.519	0.720	0.136
4-7 Years	36	140	3.889	0.844	0.919	0.153
8-11 Years	56	211	3.768	1.127	1.062	0.142
12-15 Years	39	150	3.846	0.660	0.812	0.130
16 + Years	57	193	3.386	0.991	0.996	0.132

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	***P-value***	*F crit*
Between Groups	10.303	4	2.576	2.920	**0.022**	2.414
Within Groups	186.123	211	0.882			
Total	196.426	215				

The second item found to have a significant difference between subgroup means was item 21: Having completed the ten-day evaluator training I am better able to identify effective teaching than prior to the ten-day training. Again, administrators with 0-3 years of experience had the highest mean. Their mean was 3.5, while administrators with 16 or more years of experience had a mean of 2.737.

Table 11

Having Completed the Ten-day Evaluator Training I am Better Able to Identify Effective Teaching than Prior to the Ten-day Training.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
0-3 Years	28	98	3.500	0.926	0.962	0.182
4-7 Years	35	105	3.000	0.882	0.939	0.159
8-11 Years	56	175	3.125	1.166	1.080	0.144
12-15 Years	39	122	3.128	1.167	1.080	0.173
16 + Years	57	156	2.737	1.019	1.009	0.134

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	***P-value***	*F crit*
Between Groups	11.901	4	2.975	2.833	**0.026**	2.415
Within Groups	220.537	210	1.050			
Total	232.437	214				

Complete summary of means data and ANOVA data for all questionnaire items analyzed by the subgroups of years of administrative experience can be found in Appendix F.

School Classification Size

Analysis of the variance of means in a One-Way ANOVA by the subgroup of school size found two items to have a significant difference of means at or below the 0.05 level. Item 23: Additional administrator training about identifying teacher effectiveness is needed for teacher evaluation. Finally, Item 24: Additional administrator training about teacher evaluation using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria is needed.

When analyzing Item 23: Additional administrator training about identifying teacher effectiveness is needed for teacher evaluation, the means varied from a low of 2.524 for administrators from 2-A school to a high of 3.016 for administrators from 1-A schools. Table 12 summarizes the summary of means data and the ANOVA data.

Table 12

Additional Administrator Training about Identifying Teacher Effectiveness is Needed for Teacher Evaluation.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
1-A	61	184	3.016	0.783	0.885	0.113
2-A	42	106	2.524	0.987	0.994	0.153
3-A	53	134	2.528	1.216	1.103	0.151
4-A	57	158	2.772	1.215	1.102	0.146

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	***P-value***	*F crit*
Between Groups	9.044	3	3.015	2.881	**0.037**	2.648
Within Groups	218.702	209	1.046			
Total	227.746	212				

When analyzing Item 24: Additional administrator training about teacher evaluation using the Iowa Teaching standards and Criteria is needed, a significant difference between the subgroup means was found. Administrators from 4-A schools had the lowest mean of 2.474, followed closely by 2-A administrators with 2.500 and 3-A administrators with a mean of 2.547. Again, administrators from small 1-A school had the highest mean, 3.000. Table 13 shows the summary data.

Table 13

Additional Administrator Training About Teacher Evaluation Using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria is Needed.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
1-A	61	183	3.000	0.900	0.949	0.121
2-A	42	105	2.500	0.988	0.994	0.153
3-A	53	135	2.547	1.137	1.066	0.146
4-A	57	141	2.474	1.039	1.020	0.135

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	***P-value***	*F crit*
Between Groups	10.749	3	3.583	3.535	**0.016**	2.648
Within Groups	211.843	209	1.014			
Total	222.592	212				

Data analysis of all questionnaire items analyzed by the subgroups of school classification size is located in Appendix G.

Qualitative Analysis of Open-Ended Questions

Now Better Able to Complete Teacher Evaluations

In response to Item 27: If you believe you are now better able to complete teacher evaluations, explain why you believe this, the following themes were apparent from a review of the 148 open-ended responses. The most common theme spoke to the focus the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria provided the teacher evaluation process. As one administrator stated,

> The teaching standards and criteria define the expectations administrators and teachers now have as to what is an effective teacher. It has provided a great place to start conversations with my teachers about the teaching process and offers a higher authority to which both teacher and principal can refer. It has provided me a way to make sure new teachers are teaching effectively and to get tenured teachers to recognize that some of what they are doing and have been doing for years is not effective and that they must start changing how they teach our students. (R. 25)

Fifty-six of the responses spoke directly to the clear focus. An administrator further clarified this, "The criteria has provided a more comprehensive picture of the things to look for in determining teacher effectiveness. They have allowed for much more focused discussions on effective practices." (R. 61)

The theme of improved focus transitioned directly into a related theme of the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria providing a common language for

administrators and teachers. Nineteen administrators listed a common language better enabled them to complete teacher evaluations. An administrator stated, " It is my belief that the standards allow for a more common language and understanding. They provide a means for communicating specifics about areas of improvement and the teachers have a gret [great] means of contribution." (R. 48)

Several administrators directly linked the concepts of focus and common language in their response as to why they believed they were better able to complete teacher evaluation.

> Having moved from another state and evaluation procedure, attending the training has given me a common language to use during the evaluation process. It has focused my observations to particular criteria. The standards and criteria provide me direction in conversations with the staff in regards to student achievement and teacher evaluation. (R. 73)

Another reply linking both focus and common language again highlighted this linkage.

> I am not sure about the "better able" however, I feel there is a more focused effort on student achievement. This facilitates teachers' efforts toward instruction and my efforts identifying areas of strength or needed growth. Everyone is talking the same language and the expectations are the same for meeting the eight standard areas as well as all of the forty-two criteria. It is working well. (R. 75)

A final theme, which emerged in twelve responses, was the belief that the evaluation process now used was an improved process. While one could argue the responses discussed previously all could be linked to an improved process through a better focus and common language, these twelve responses spoke directly to an improved teacher evaluation process.

It was stated, " I feel that the new evaluation process leads us to do a more thorough evaluation of teachers thus my evaluations are " better." (R. 58) Another administrator said,

> This new process has opened up the lines of communication between the evaluator and the teacher. It is exciting to dialogue about the growth that occurs during the two years. The portfolio conference is a wonderful time to listen to the teacher reflect about how he/she has grown. Talking points are more specific. (R. 50)

Not Better Able to Complete Teacher Evaluations

Seventy-one administrators responded to questionnaire Item 28 that they did not believe they were now better able to complete teacher evaluation than before the ten-day training. When asked; If you believe you are not any better able to complete teacher evaluations, explain why you believe this. Three themes became apparent and are discussed in the following section.

The theme generating the most comments (19) was the theme of previous evaluation experience or processes. Nineteen administrators stated that either their previous evaluation process contained many or most of the standards and

criteria, or their previous administrative experience enabled them to evaluate teachers more effectively than the ten-day training.

> Our district had already invested a significant amount of time utilizing A Framework for Teaching by Charlotte Danielson. The Iowa Teaching Standards are based on Danielson's work. So, for us, the required ten days were overkill, and a waste of significant time. (R 22)

Related comments such as, " Our evaluation process addressed all of the standards and most of the criteria." (R. 14), and "I believe our district had many of the elements of the state evaluation process in place prior to the standards. We used Danielson's Framework for teaching. We built in reflective practice. We provided constructive feedback." (R. 23), were common explanations as to why an administrator did not perceive he/she was any better able to complete teacher evaluation than before the required ten days of training.

A second theme discussed by seventeen administrators focused on the increased time needed to complete the evaluation process. " It is so incredibly time consuming, I shortened other duties, including time in the classroom." (R. 5)

Another experienced administrator stated,

> After 16 years of experience, the evaluative process does not change. The terminology may change but the ability to observe "quality" teaching does not need to be a cumbersome one, which this new model certainly will be. The amount of time it takes to complete the new process is unwieldy. (R. 16)

A third theme emerged and focused on the ten-day training all administrators were required to attend. Thirteen administrators spoke to the issue of the training. " I have had previous training in teacher evaluation before the Teacher Quality legislation was passed. I feel that I was able to be as thorough and effective in teacher evaluation as I am not after the Evaluator training sessions." (R. 44)

An additional comment about the design and depth of the training included:

> The training for this model is poorly designed and there is no research-base to prove that these standards and criteria are going to improve student achievement. Also, many of the trainers were not actual practioners and the activities were meaningless. The model is basically the old model squeezed into the new model. (R. 12)

Need for Additional State Support

One hundred eight administrators responded in the affirmative when asked on Item 29, if additional state support was needed to effectively implement the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria into the teacher evaluation process in their district. As one administrator stated:

> Financial support is required to be able to effectively implement the teaching standards and criteria; this support would also provide for professional development, substitutes, and collaboration for educators and administrators. Community support for the educational system is needed.

> There does not always seem to be a clear understanding of the tasks at hand within a school setting. (R. 26)

Forty-six administrators' comments related to the need for increased funding from the state. Thirty-three administrators commented that increased support from the state for teacher training was needed and 18 stated that additional administrator training was needed.

There was overlap in the responses with 21 administrators linking funding directly to the need for professional staff development training of teachers. "Training of the teachers requires time. The state needs to provide money to support this training." (R. 53). Additional comments were made related to funding and professional development.

> We need more financial support to train our teachers in effective methods of instruction. Budget cuts are limiting opportunities for professional development for our teachers and administrators. We are also bogged down with a higher degree of red tape due to the increase of accountability we are experiencing today. When you increase expectations you should also be able to increase compensation. Unfortunately, we are doing the first without the latter. We are driving excellent educators away from the profession because we cannot pay them what they are worth. (R. 22)

Eighteen administrators stated additional administrator training and follow-up was needed. Responses included the need for training in how to coach

teachers, how to assist struggling teachers, and follow-up to address any questions following implementation. One administrator's comments captured four other similar comments about trimming or streamline the process, "Follow-up training to discuss pro's and con's. How to improve. What is working? How to streamline [the] process." (R. 36)

Description of Previous Evaluation Process

One hundred ninety administrators responded to Item 30 of the survey requesting information about their school district's evaluation process before the implementation of the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria. A process including a combination of evaluation methods was the most widely reported process. Fifty-five administrators reported a process using a rating/ranking checklist with narrative descriptions. Thirty-seven identified their process as strictly a checklist/rating process, while 29 administrators stated their evaluation process was based primarily on the clinical supervision model.

Twenty-six administrators stated their district's past evaluation process was similar or very similar to the process setup to incorporate the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria. These 26 administrators stated their previous system incorporated standards and criteria very comparable to the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria. In fact, seven administrators stated their school's system was designed around Charlotte Danielson's work on teacher evaluation.

Comment on Aspects of Teacher Evaluation that may be Helpful in Understanding Your Perceptions about Teacher Evaluation.

These additional comments centered around three themes. Two of which focused on concerns with the new process while the third theme focused on the positive improvements the new process has caused in teacher evaluation in their district.

The largest group of respondents focused on concerns about the process of incorporating the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria into the teacher evaluation process. Thirty-three administrators voiced concern about the process with 23 of the concerns centering on the previously discussed topic of the time required to complete an evaluation incorporating the new standards and criteria. Administrators voiced concern they didn't have the time needed to evaluate all staff using a process incorporating the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria. One administrator described the concerns as,

> The time commitment involved in the evaluation process is enormous and has made it nearly impossible to evaluate my new staff under the new Iowa Teaching Standards and keep up with the remainder of evaluations of my veteran staff. In the future I'm not sure if I will have the time to effectively evaluate all staff using this process. (R. 31)

Ten administrators reiterated the need for additional teacher training if the implementation of the new standards and criteria is to be successful. Two lengthy

descriptive quotes from concerned administrators summarize this concern about the need for additional teacher staff development and training.

> The teachers need more information regarding the new Iowa Standards. They need to understand how the standards can help them take a more effective look at how they teach, so they can set goals for themselves. The teacher will become better which will lead to higher student achievement. Right now all the teachers see are "more requirements", "another way to put the blame on us", "another way to make us do more for the same money or even less", etc. There needs to be more effective communication with the teachers so they will feel more comfortable with the standards and what is expected from them. This should be in the form of staff development classes with recertification credit attached and there should be a stipend for their time. Teachers and administrators already donate too much of their time to their schools to be donating more due to new state requirements as well. (R. 4)

> I believe the missing piece is the teacher training on what constitutes good teaching. If the purpose of evaluation is to create better teachers, let's help the teachers get better. The teacher quality act is an ambitious piece of legislation. I'm afraid it is becoming one of many unfunded mandates. There is still much left to interpretation. Aside from the first and second year staff, different districts approach teacher evaluation differently. The inconsistency could potentially undermine the

> legislation, along with the lack of funding. I philosophically struggle with the Team Based Variable pay provision in the teacher quality act. It is insulting to educators to imply they will work harder for a few hundred more dollars. (R. 33)

Finally, 20 administrators provided additional comments in support of an evaluation process involving the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria. These administrators stated they believed the implementation of a teacher evaluation process using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria has resulted in improved teacher evaluation in their school district. Several administrators spoke of the change as a positive move.

> I think that overall it is a positive move. I am much more in tune to it this year. Last year I found it more than a little difficult to be learning about something while trying to train teachers and implement all at the same time. However, like I said, I have had time to process my learning and fit this new evaluation tool into our district needs. (R. 10)

> This is a process which appears to have a lot to offer to the concept of evaluation and accountability. Its seems to be acceptable, for the most part, by all stakeholders. If we can avoid the pitfalls of microanalysis, I believe it can lead to improved student performance. (R. 6)

It is from these finding reported in Chapter 4, that the summary, conclusions, and recommendation are drawn. The perceptions of two hundred twenty-eight Iowa Public School Administrators provided the data for these

findings from which the conclusions in Chapter 5 are drawn. Chapter 5 highlights the conclusions drawn from the significant findings of this study and details the resulting recommendations.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, DISSCUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study was designed to determine administrator perceptions on the implementation of the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria. In addition, this study investigated administrators' perceptions about their ability to better identify effective teaching following the training about and the implementation of the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria and the differences and similarities between subgroups of Iowa administrators as determined by grade levels supervised, years of experience as an administrator, and the size of school in which the administrator was employed. Finally, this study identified administrators' perceptions about the capability of Iowa school districts to evaluate all Iowa teachers with the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria by July 1, 2005.

Conclusions

The study yielded findings that have important implications for Iowa administrators as they evaluate teachers and move to implement the mandate of all teacher evaluation with the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria.

1. The study's highest ranked perception about the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria was on questionnaire Item 13: Incorporating the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria into the teacher evaluation process has increased the time I spend in completing teacher

evaluation. Ninety-three percent of 216 administrators reported they were spending increased time on teacher evaluation. Only 14 administrators reported they were spending approximately the same amount of time on teacher evaluation.

2. Eighty-six percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with Item 17 that: My district will be ready to implement an evaluation process using the Iowa Teaching standards and Criteria with all teachers by July 1, 2005. Of the 14% of respondents who did not agree with the above statement, 11% were undecided, while only 3% of respondents stated they disagreed that their district would be ready to implement the teaching standards and criteria with all teachers in July 2005.
3. Sixty-eight percent of responding Iowa administrators agreed or strongly agreed with Item 11: I believe that incorporating the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria for teacher evaluation has improved my school's teacher evaluation process. Eighteen percent of the respondents reported they were undecided if their school's evaluation process had been improved, while only 14% disagreed or strongly disagreed that the incorporation of the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria for teacher evaluation had not improve their school's teacher evaluation process. While 68% of administrators believe their school's teacher evaluation process has improved, only 58% agreed with Item

12: I believe that mandating statewide teacher evaluation standards and criteria has improved teacher evaluation in Iowa.

4. Forty-four percent of administrators stated they were better able to identify effective teaching following the ten-day evaluator training, while 38% reported that they were not any better able to identify effective teaching.
5. Fifty-four percent of administrators responded that additional state support was needed to effectively implement the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria.
6. Forty-eight percent of administrators did not agree that additional administrator training was needed to assist evaluators with the identification of effective teaching. In addition, 52% of administrators did not agree that additional administrative training was needed about teacher evaluation processes.
7. Sixty-seven percent of administrators stated additional teacher staff development was needed to assist teachers in the identification of teacher effectiveness, while 63% of administrators reported they believed additional teacher training was needed about a teacher evaluation process using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria.
8. Only 39% of administrators reported they expected student achievement in their school to improve as a result of implementing the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria, 41% were undecided and 20%

reported they did not expect student achievement to improve in their district. In addition, only 41% of administrators reported they expected student achievement in Iowa to improve as a result of the teacher evaluation processes, with 41% again undecided and 18% of administrators not expecting improved student achievement in Iowa.

9. The data analysis through the use of a One-Way ANOVA determined there was significant variance of the means between the administrative grade levels supervised subgroups on Item 24: Additional administrator training about teacher evaluation using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria is needed. While all three subgroups displayed means showing disagreement with the item, Elementary Administrators had the lowest mean of 2.510, while Middle Level Administrators had a mean of 2.906.
10. Analysis of the difference of means using a One-Way ANOVA on the subgroups defined by the years of administrative experience identified two questionnaire items that were significant at or below the 0.05 level. The first item found with a significant variance was questionnaire Item 11: I believe that incorporating the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria for teacher evaluation has improved my school's teacher evaluation process. The subgroup of administrators with 0-3 years of experience had a mean of 4.000, with the subgroup of administrators with 16+ years of experience having a mean of 3.386. Administrators

with less experience believed at a higher level that the evaluation process in their district was improved following the incorporation of the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria.

11. The second item found to have a significant difference between subgroup means based on years of administrative experience was Item 21: Having completed the ten-day evaluator training I am better able to identify effective teaching than prior to the ten-day training. Again, administrators with 0-3 years of experience had the highest mean. Their mean was 3.5, while administrators with 16 or more years of experience had a mean of 2.737. Administrators with less experience believed that they were better able to identify effective teaching after the ten-day training, while experienced administrator disagreed that the ten-day training better enabled them to identify effective teaching.

12. Analysis of the difference of means using a One-Way ANOVA on the subgroups defined by school size found two items to have a significant difference of means at or below the 0.05 level. When analyzing Item 23: Additional administrator training about identifying teacher effectiveness is needed for teacher evaluation, the mean varied from a low of 2.524 for administrators from 2-A schools to a high of 3.016 for administrators from 1-A schools. Larger school administrators disagreed that additional administrative training was needed to identify

effective teaching. Only the small 1-A school administrators had a mean above 3.0.

13. Analysis of the second item found to have a significant difference in means of the subgroups based on school size was Item 24: Additional administrator training about teacher evaluation using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria is needed. Administrators from 4-A schools had the lowest mean of 2.474, followed closely by 2-A administrators with 2.500 and 3-A administrators with a mean of 2.547. Again, administrators from small 1-A school had the highest mean 3.000, and was again the only subgroup that did not disagree or strongly disagree with the need for additional administrator training about teacher evaluation.

Discussion

The results of this study add to the limited amount of research regarding the implementations of the state mandated Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria. The data from this study were important to gather, because according to the Iowa Department of Education 359 of Iowa's 371 school districts employed first or second year teachers during the 2002-2003 school year. Therefore, 96.8% of Iowa's school districts have been immediately impacted by the *Student Achievement and Teacher Quality* legislation and resulting laws.

The highest ranked perception in the findings related to time: 93% of administrators reported they were spending increased time on teacher

evaluation, with 64.7% of administrators spending 50% or more time then previously spent on teacher evaluation. One wonders how administrators are coping with this increased time demand. What job responsibilities are being slighted to complete the state mandated teacher evaluation? Administrators voiced concern on the open-end items of the survey about how they were going to be able to complete the teacher evaluation process when all teachers needed to be evaluated with the Iowa Teaching Standards beginning with the 2005-2006 school year. With that said though, the findings also showed that 68% of the responding administrators believed that the evaluation process in their school was improved with the incorporation of the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria. While administrators are concerned about the time commitments of the new evaluation processes, administrators believe the process in their school has been improved with the implementation of the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria.

A significant difference in the means was found using a One-Way ANOVA to analyze administrators' responses by the subgroups of years of experience about the improvement in teacher evaluation in their school. Administrators with the least experience had the highest mean rating of 4.000, while veteran administrators with 16+ years of experience had a positive rating of 3.386.

A smaller percent of administrators, 58%, believe that teacher evaluation in Iowa has improved. It is interesting to note that 68% of administrators believe there has been improvement in their school while only 58% of administrators

believe teacher evaluation processes have improved across all Iowa schools. This researcher cannot state why this paradox exists, but it is interesting to note that some administrators believe their school is improving while believing other schools in Iowa are not improving.

In addressing the research question if Iowa school districts will be ready to implement a teacher evaluation process incorporating the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria with all teachers by July 1, 2005, 86% of administrators stated their district would be ready, while only 3% stated their district would not be ready by 2005. It should be noted that 47% of administrators reported their district had already implemented a teacher evaluation process with all teachers using the Iowa Standards and Criteria. The findings indicate a large majority of administrators believe full implementation will be attainable by the 2005-2006 school year.

In reviewing the data about administrators' ability to better identify effective teaching, only 44% of administrators felt they were better able to identify effective teaching following the ten-day training, which was required of all Iowa evaluators. When analyzing the subgroup data based on years of administrative experience with the use of a One-Way ANOVA it was found that administrators with the least experience held the highest mean of 3.5, while veteran administrators with 16+ years, again had the lowest mean of 2.737. The experienced administrators' mean fell within the disagreement range on the item asking if they were better able to identify effective teaching. Administrative

comments from the open-ended items again gives some insight on the issues surrounding the identification of effective teaching. Several comments spoke to the fact that previous training and previous experience in teacher evaluation enabled veteran administrators to identify effective teaching.

A final subgroup finding related to the identification of teacher effectiveness, was administrators from small 1-A schools had a positive mean of 3.016 when asked if additional administrative training was needed. All other subgroups of administrators had means, which were below the 3.00 level, with 2-A school administrators ranking the need for additional administrative training in the identification of teacher effectiveness 2.524. The findings indicate administrators from small schools believe at a higher level than other subgroup that there is a need for further training.

Additional study findings related to administrative training show that administrators do not believe they need additional training to identify effective teachers or to complete teacher evaluations. Only 29% of administrators felt additional training about effective teaching was needed, with 48% of administrators disagreeing with the need for additional training in identifying teacher effectiveness. In addition, only 27% of administrators agreed that additional administrative training about the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria and the teacher evaluation process is needed, while 52% disagreed. It is clear from these numbers that the majority of Iowa administrators believe they possess

the skills necessary to identify effective teaching and to successfully complete teacher evaluation.

Using a One-Way ANOVA to analyze the subgroups of school size found a significant difference in the means between the groups about the need for additional administrator training on teacher evaluation. It was again found that administrators from small 1-A schools had the highest mean of 3.000, while large 4-A school administrators had a mean of 2.474. Again, several comments from the open-ended items may shed light on the differences between small and large schools. Several administrators spoke to the fact the 10-day training gave them the opportunity to have professional dialogue with colleagues about teacher effectiveness and teacher evaluation. Small school administrators are often much more isolated than large 4-A school administrators who often have multiple administrative colleagues within their own district. This isolation may account for some of the variance between the two groups.

Fifty-four percent of administrators stated they believed additional state support was needed to effectively implement the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria. While money was often the focus of the comments linked to additional state support, a number of administrators stated additional training of teachers was needed. Sixty-seven percent of administrators believed additional teacher training on the identification of teacher effective was needed. In addition, 63% of administrators stated additional teacher training was needed about teacher evaluation using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria. One can wonder why

administrators believe they do not need additional training while at the same time believing teachers need additional training. A partial answer may again be found in the open-end responses. Several administrators stated in their districts that very few veteran teachers had received any training about the new Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria. Concern was expressed about how the training and staff development of veteran staff would be accomplished without additional state support for staff development. Several administrators stated the two years of required training for first and second year teachers on teacher effectiveness and teacher evaluation gave those first and second year teachers a better understanding of the newly mandated requirements than their more experienced colleagues.

A final discussion topic to be reviewed is one of significant concern. Sixty-eight percent of the responding administrators reported the evaluation process in their school was improved with the implementation and use of the Iowa Teaching Standard and Criteria, while only 39% of administrators expected student achievement to increase in their school as a result of implementing the Iowa Teaching Standard and Criteria in their school's teacher evaluation process. In addition, 58% of administrators believed teacher evaluations in Iowa have improved while only 41% of administrators expected student achievement in Iowa to improve as a result of implementing the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria.

Why this disconnect between teacher evaluation, teacher effectiveness and student achievement? One should wonder why there is a disconnect between a reported improvement in the teacher evaluation process and the low expectations for improved student achievement. Do administrators not believe that teacher evaluation leads to better and more effective teaching? Do administrators not believe that more effective teaching results in improved student learning? Why should a significant portion of administrators' time be focused on an activity where there is the limited belief that student achievement will be improved as a result of the teacher evaluation being completed? These questions lead to the recommendations for further study of the topics of teacher effectiveness, teacher evaluation, and student achievement in Iowa schools.

Recommendations

This study identifies important factors in the implementation of the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria. In addition, important perceptual information from Iowa Public School Administrators is reported. Specific recommendations are provided below.

1. Additional research should be completed to determine teacher perceptions about the implementation of the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria. Little research is available on this recent state mandate and this study provides data only on administrators' perceptions. It would be helpful to school leaders to know if teacher perceptions are

similar or different from the administrators' who are completing teacher evaluation.

2. In December of 2003 and January of 2004, only 47% of the respondents stated that their school district had implemented a process using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria with all teachers. It is the recommendation of this researcher that a statewide study be undertaken following July 2005 and the full implementation of the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria to determine if administrator perceptions about teacher evaluation, teacher effectiveness, and student achievement are similar to this 2004 study. Following the 2005 – 2006 school year, researchers could compile data from administrators and teachers from four school years, with all school district having at least one full year of using the state mandated standards and criteria in teacher evaluation.
3. Research should be completed to determine if administrators' concerns about the time needed for teacher evaluation with a process using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria changes with time and evaluative experience. The study found that 93% of administrators believe that the process involved a larger time commitment to complete teacher evaluations. In addition, a study of administrative time committed to teacher evaluation should investigate the impacts, if any, on the other administrative job functions and responsibilities.

4. Research should be undertaken to determine if the implementation of a teacher evaluation process using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria is having an impact on student achievement in Iowa schools. Only 39% of the responding administrators expect student achievement to increase in their school district because of implementing the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria and only 41% of the respondents expect student achievement in Iowa to improve because of this implementation. While this researcher does not have a specific recommendation on how one would determine which changes in student achievement would be attributable to teacher evaluation and which changes would be attributable to local school improvement plans, No Child Left Behind Initiatives, and other student achievement focused initiatives, it is believed data about teacher evaluation when linked to teacher effectiveness and ultimately student achievement would be important data to collect and study.

This study gathered and analyzed data on administrator perceptions about the implementation and use of the state mandated Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria in the teacher evaluation process in Iowa schools. Eighty-six percent of the respondents stated their district would be ready for full implementation of an evaluation process incorporating the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria with all teachers, by July 1, 2005.

The analysis of data indicates that 66% of the administrators responding believe classroom instruction by beginning teachers will improve as a result of using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria in the teacher evaluation process. Sixty-eight percent of the respondents believe that the teacher evaluation process in their school district has improved as a result of implementing and using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria, and 58% of administrators believe teacher evaluation in Iowa has improved.

As stated in the above recommendations, additional research needs to be completed to determine if teacher perceptions are in agreement with administrator perceptions about teacher effectiveness and the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria. Second, research into any changes in administrators' perceptions over time with the full implementation of the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria with the teacher evaluation of all teachers is needed. Third, research needs to be undertaken to determine if the administrative time demands required to complete teacher evaluations change over time, and if there are any significant changes or impacts on the time demands of other administrative job functions and responsibilities as a result of the teacher evaluation process. Finally, if possible, a study of the effects the new teacher evaluation processes are having on teacher effectiveness and student achievement in Iowa schools should be undertaken.

This research study should be just one of several studies over the next three to five years to determine the impact *A Student Achievement and Teacher*

Quality Law and its resulting state mandated standards and criteria for teacher evaluation are having on teacher evaluation, teacher effectiveness, and student achievement in Iowa schools.

REFERENCES

Beerens, D. R. (2000*). Evaluating teachers for professional growth: Creating a culture of motivation and learning.* Thousand Oaks, CA.: Corwin Press Inc.

Bickers, P. M. (1988). *Teacher evaluation: Practices and procedures.* Arlington, VA: Educational Research Services.

Bradshaw, L. K. (2002, June). Local district implementation of state mandated teacher evaluation policies and procedures: The North Carolina case. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 16,* 113-127.

Brandt, R. (1985, February). On teaching and supervising: A conversation with Madeline Hunter. *Educational Leadership, 58*, 61-66.

Costa, A. L., & Garmston, R. J. (1994). *Cognitive Coaching: A foundation for renaissance schools.* Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.

Cruickshank, D. R., & Haefele, D. (2001, February). Good teachers, plural. *Educational Leadership, 58,* 26-30.

Danielson, C. (1996). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching.* Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Danielson, C. (2001, February). New trends in teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership, 58,* 12-15.

Danielson, C. (2002). *Enhancing student achievement: A framework for school improvement.* Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Danielson, C., & McGreal, T. L. (2000). *Teacher evaluation: To enhance professional practice*. Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Davis, D. R., Ellett, C. D., & Annunziata, J. (2002, December). Teacher evaluation, leadership and learning organizations. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 16,* 287-301.

Downey, C. J., & Frase, L. E. (2003). *Conducting Downey walk-throughs with reflective inquiry to maximize student achievement: Cutting edge practices series.* Johnston, IA: Curriculum Management Systems, Inc. (CMSI).

Ellett, C. D., & Teddlie, C. (2003, March). Teacher evaluation, teacher effectiveness and school effectiveness: Perspectives from the USA. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 17,* 101-128.

Gitlin, A. D., & Smyth, J. (1989). *Teacher evaluation: Educative alternatives.* Philadelphia, PA: The Fulmer Press.

Glasgow, N. A., & Hicks, C. D. (2003). *What successful teachers do: 91 research-based classroom strategies for new and veteran teachers.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press Inc.

Glasser, W. (1993). *The quality school teacher: A companion volume to the quality school.* New York: Harper Perennial.

Glickman, C. D. (2002). *Leadership for learning: How to help teachers succeed.* Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

House File 413. Seventy-ninth General Assembly. (2001). *An act making an appropriation for purposes of the student achievement and teacher quality program and providing for contingent effectiveness.*

House File 2549. Seventy-ninth General Assembly. (2001). *An act relating to students and school district employees by amending the student achievement and teacher quality program and language pertaining to retirement incentives and providing an effective date.*

Hunter, M. (1985, February). What's wrong with Madeline Hunter? *Educational Leadership, 42,* 57-60.

Hunter, M. (1998). Create rather than await your fate in teacher evaluation. In S. J. Stanley & W. J. Popham (Eds.), *Teacher evaluation: Six prescriptions for success.* (pp. 32-54). Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Iowa Department of Education. *Iowa Teaching Standards and Model Criteria Adopted by the State Board of Education 05/10/02.* Retrieved November 2, 2003, from http://www.state.ia.us/educate/ecese/tqt/tc/documents.html

Iowa Legislature. (2003). *Iowa Code 2003: Section 284.1 through Section 284.13.* Retrieved May 12, 2003, from http://www.legis.state.ia.us/IACODE/2003/284/1.html through http://www.legis.state.ia.us/IACODE/2003/284/13.html

Iwanicki, E. F. (2001, February). Focusing teacher evaluations on student learning. *Educational Leadership, 58,* 57-59.

Krueger, D., & Wilkinson, D. (2002*). A framework for understanding the Iowa teaching standards and criteria.* Des Moines IA: Iowa State Education Association.

Lawler, D. W. (1992). An examination of teacher evaluation in Iowa. (Doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University, 1992). Dissertations Abstracts International, 414.

Manatt, R. P., & Kemis, M. (1997, September). A new approach to evaluation. *Principal, 77,* 24, 26-27

Manatt, R. P., & Stow, S. B. (1984). *Clinical manual for teacher performance evaluation.* Ames, IA: Iowa State University Research Foundation.

Manning, R. (1988). *The teacher evaluation handbook: Step-by-step techniques and forms for improving instruction.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall

Martin-Kniep, G. O. (2000). *Becoming a better teacher: Eight innovations that work.* Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Marzano, R. J. (1998). *A theory-based meta-analysis of research on instruction.* Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory

McGreal, T. L. (1983). *Successful teacher evaluation.* Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

McGreal, T. L. (1990,December). The use of rating scales in teacher evaluation: Concerns and recommendations. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 4,* 41-58.

Medley, D. M., Coker. H., & Soar, R. S. (1984). *Measurement based evaluation of teacher performance an empirical approach.* New York: Longman.

Medley, D. M., & Coker., H. (1987, March/April). The accuracy of principals' judgments of teacher performance. *Journal of Educational Research, 80,* 242-247.

Muijs, D., & Reynolds, D., (2001). *Effective teaching: Evidence and practice.* London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

National Association of Elementary School Principals. (2001). *Leading learning communities: Standards for what principals should know and be able to do.* Alexandria, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals.

Painter, B. (2001, February). Using teaching portfolios. *Educational Leadership, 58,* 31-34.

Peterson, K. D. (2000). *Teacher evaluation: A comprehensive guide to new directions and practices.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Peterson, K. D., Wahlquist, C., Bone, K., Thompson, J., & Chatterton, K. (2001, February). Using more data sources to evaluate teachers. *Educational Leadership, 58,* 40-43.

Protheroe, N. (2002, September/October). Improving instruction through teacher observation. *Principal, 82,* 48-51.

Protheroe, N. (2004, March/April). Effective teaching. *Principal, 83,* 58-62.

Reavis, C. A. (1976, February). Clinical supervision: A timely approach. *Educational Leadership, 33,* 360-363.

Schermer, D. (2003, March). An electronic interview with Jeff Berger. *Iowa Educational Leadership, 5,* 10-16.

Schmidt, L. (2003, March /April). Getting about supervision of instruction. *Principal, 82,* 24-28

Searfoss, L. W., & Enz, B.J. (1996, March). Can teacher evaluation reflect holistic instruction? *Educational Leadership, 53,* 38-41

Senate File 476. Seventy-ninth General Assembly. (2001). *An Act Relating To the Establishment of a Student Achievement and Teacher Quality Program and Providing for Contingent Effectiveness.*

Soar, R.S., Medley, D.M., & Coker. (1983, December). Teacher evaluation: A critique of currently used methods. *Phi Delta Kappan, 65,* 4, 239-246.

Stanley, S. J., & Popham W. J. (Eds.). (1988). *Teacher evaluation: Six prescriptions for success.* Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Stiggins, R.J., & Duke. D. (1988). *The case for commitment to teacher growth research on teacher evaluation.* Albany, New York: State University of New York Press

Stronge, J. H. (1997). *Evaluating teaching: A guide to current thinking and best practices.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press Inc.

Stronge, J. H. (2002). *Qualities of effective teachers.* Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Stronge, J. H., & Tucker, P. D. (2000). *Teacher evaluation and student achievement.* Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Sweeney, J. (1992, August). The effects of evaluator training on teacher evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 6,* 7-14.

Tileston, D. W. (2000). *10 best teaching practices: How brain research, learning styles, and standards define teaching competencies.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press Inc.

Tucker, P. D, (1997, September). Lake Wobegon: Where all the teachers are competent (or, have we come to terms with the problem of incompetent teachers?). *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 11,* 103-126.

Tucker, P. D, (2001, February). Helping struggling teachers. *Educational Leadership, 58,* 52-55.

Tucker, P. D., Stronge, J. H., & Gareis, C. R. (2002). *Handbook on teacher portfolios for evaluation and professional development.* Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

Tucker, P. D., Stronge, J. H., Gareis, C. R., & Beers, C. S. (2003, December). The efficacy of portfolios for teacher evaluation and professional development: Do they make a difference? *Educational Administration Quarterly, 5,* 572-602.

Veir, C. A., & Dagley, D. L. (2002). Legal issues in teacher evaluation legislation: A study of state statutory provisions. *Brigham Young University Education and Law Journal, 1,* 1-1.

Walberg, H. J., & Paik, S. J. (2004). Effective general practices. In G. Cawelti (Ed.), *Handbook of research on improving student achievement (3rd edition).* (pp. 25-38*).* Arlington, Va.: Educational Research Service.

Wang, M. C., Haertel, G. D., & Walberg, H. J. (1993, Fall). Toward a knowledge base for school learning. *Review of Educational Research, 3,* 249-294.

Wilson, B., & Wood, J. (1996, March). Teacher evaluation: A national dilemma. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 10,* 75-82.

Wise, A. E., & Darling-Hammond, L. (1984,December/ 1985, January). Teacher evaluation and teacher professionalism. *Educational Leadership, 42,* 28-33.

Wise, A. E., Darling-Hammond, L., McLaughlin, M.W., & Bernstein, H.T. (1984). *Teacher evaluation: A study of effective practices.* Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Wong, H. K., & Wong, R. T. (1998). *How to be an effective teacher: The first days of school.* Mountain View, CA: Harry K. Wong Publications, Inc.

APPENDIXES

Appendix A

Iowa Teaching Standards

The following Iowa Teaching Standards are found in Section 4 of Senate File 476. 79th General Assembly (2001). *An Act Relating To the Establishment of a Student Achievement and Teacher Quality Program and Providing for Contingent Effectiveness.*

The eight Iowa standards for teacher evaluation are listed below.

1. Demonstrates ability to enhance academic performance and support for and implementation of the school district's student achievement goals.
2. Demonstrates competence in content knowledge appropriated to the teaching position.
3. Demonstrates competence in planning and preparing for instruction
4. Uses strategies to deliver instruction that meets the multiple learning needs of students.
5. Uses a variety of methods to monitor student learning.
6. Demonstrates competence in classroom management.
7. Engages in professional growth.
8. Fulfills professional responsibilities established by the school district.

The following detailed list of the standards from the Department of Education contains the criteria adopted by the State Board of Education on May 10, 2002.

Iowa Teaching Standards and Model Criteria
Adopted by the State Board of Education
5/10/02

Standard 1

Demonstrates ability to enhance academic performance and support for implementation of the school district's student achievement goals.

Model Criteria

The teacher:

a. Provides evidence of student learning to students, families, and staff.
b. Implements strategies supporting student, building, and district goals.
c. Uses student performance data as a guide for decision making.
d. Accepts and demonstrates responsibility for creating a classroom culture that supports the learning of every student.
e. Creates an environment of mutual respect, rapport, and fairness.
f. Participates in and contributes to a school culture that focuses on improved student learning.
g. Communicates with students, families, colleagues, and communities effectively and accurately.

Standard 2

Demonstrates competence in content knowledge appropriate to the teaching position.

Model Criteria

The teacher:

a. Understands and uses key concepts, underlying themes, relationships, and different perspectives related to the content area.
b. Uses knowledge of student development to make learning experiences in the content area meaningful and accessible for every student.
c. Relates ideas and information within and across content areas.
d. Understands and uses instructional strategies that are appropriate to the content area.

Standard 3

Demonstrates competence in planning and preparing for instruction.

Model Criteria

The teacher:

a. Uses student achievement data, local standards, and the district curriculum in planning for instruction.
b. Sets and communicates high expectations for social, behavioral, and academic success of all students.
c. Uses student's developmental needs, backgrounds, and interests in planning for instruction.
d. Selects strategies to engage all students in learning.
e. Uses available resources, including technologies, in the development and sequencing of instruction.

Standard 4

Uses strategies to deliver instruction that meets the multiple learning needs of students.

Model Criteria

The teacher:

a. Aligns classroom instruction with local standards and district curriculum.
b. Uses research-based instructional strategies that address the full range of cognitive levels.
c. Demonstrates flexibility and responsiveness in adjusting instruction to meet student needs.
d. Engages students in varied experiences that meet diverse needs and promote social, emotional, and academic growth.
e. Connects students' prior knowledge, life experiences, and interests in the instructional process.
f. Uses available resources, including technologies, in the delivery of instruction.

Standard 5

Uses a variety of methods to monitor student learning.

Model Criteria

The teacher:

a. Aligns classroom assessment with instruction.
b. Communicates assessment criteria and standards to all students and parents.
c. Understands and uses the results of multiple assessments to guide planning and instruction.
d. Guides students in goal setting and assessing their own learning.
e. Provides substantive, timely, and constructive feedback to students and parents.
f. Works with other staff and building and district leadership in analysis of student progress.

Standard 6

Demonstrates competence in classroom management.

Model Criteria

The teacher:

a. Creates a learning community that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement, and self-regulation for every student.
b. Establishes, communicates, models, and maintains standards of responsible student behavior.
c. Develops and implements classroom procedures and routines that support high expectations for student learning.
d. Uses instructional time effectively to maximize student achievement.
e. Creates a safe and purposeful learning environment.

Standard 7

Engages in professional growth.

Model Criteria

The teacher:

a. Demonstrates habits and skills of continuous inquiry and learning.
b. Works collaboratively to improve professional practice and student learning.
c. Applies research, knowledge, and skills from professional development opportunities to improve practice.
d. Establishes and implements professional development plans based upon the teacher's needs aligned to the Iowa teaching standards and district/building student achievement goals.

Standard 8

Fulfills professional responsibilities established by the school district.

Model Criteria

The teacher:

a. Adheres to board policies, district procedures, and contractual obligations.
b. Demonstrates professional and ethical conduct as defined by state law and district policy.
c. Contributes to efforts to achieve district and building goals.
d. Demonstrates an understanding of and respect for all learners and staff.
e. Collaborates with students, families, colleagues, and communities to enhance student learning.

Appendix B

Letter to Administrators

December 10, 2003

Dear School Administrator,

I am writing to request your assistance in gathering information about the implementation and use of the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria for the evaluation of beginning teachers in selected Iowa schools.

In approximately one week, you will receive an email requesting your input on an electronic survey. I would ask that you go to the indicated web site address and complete the electronic survey on identifying teacher effectiveness through a teacher evaluation process using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria.

This is your opportunity to provide direct feedback about the training on, and the implementation of, the new Teaching Standards and Criteria to the Department of Education, the Iowa Legislature, the Iowa School Board Association, and School Administrators of Iowa, as research findings will be disseminated to all groups.

You were randomly selected to participate in this study. Your response is important if an accurate analysis of current implementation of the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria and teacher evaluation practices is to be completed. The survey should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. If you would like to receive a summary of the research finding, please email your request to: bamendt@johnston.k12.ia.us . If you are not the administrator in your building evaluating first and second year teachers please forward the name of the evaluator that I should contact to the above email address.

Your participation in completing the survey is voluntary and will be considered your consent to be part of this study. All responses will be completely confidential. No individual or district data will be compiled or released.

Thank you for your prompt response to this request.

Sincerely,

Bruce C. Amendt
Elementary Principal
Doctoral Candidate
Drake University
515-278-6977

Dr. Eunice Merideth
Associate Dean, School of Education
Drake University
Des Moines, Iowa
515-271-2599

Appendix C

E-mail to Administrators

Dear School Administrator,

I am writing to request your assistance in gathering information about the implementation and use of the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria in selected Iowa schools.

You were randomly selected to participate in this study. Your response is important if an accurate analysis of current implementation and teacher evaluation practices is to be completed. The survey should take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

This is your opportunity to provide direct feedback about the new Teaching Standards and Criteria to the Department of Education, the Iowa Legislature, the Iowa School Board Association, and School Administrators of Iowa, as research findings will be disseminated to all groups.

Your participation in completing this survey will be considered your consent to be part of this study. Your participation is voluntary and all responses will be completely confidential. No individual or district data will be compiled or released. It is very important to receive your response as you were randomly selected from all Iowa administrators to complete this survey. Please go to the following web site: http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?A=17570960E1313 to complete the survey.

Thank you for your prompt response to this request. If you would like to receive a summary of the research finding, please email your request to: bamendt@johnston.k12.ia.us

Sincerely,

Bruce C. Amendt
Elementary Principal
Doctoral Candidate
Drake University
515-278-6977

Dr. Eunice Merideth
Associate Dean, School of Education
Drake University
Des Moines, Iowa
515-271-2599

See below:

Here is a link to the survey:

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?A=17570960E1313

Please note: If do not wish to receive further emails from us, please click the link below, and you will be automatically removed from our mailing list.

http://www.surveymonkey.com/r.asp?A=17570960E1313

Appendix D
Administrator Questionnaire

1. Basic Demographic Data

1. Administrative level of respondent:

- Elementary
- Middle Level
- High School
- Superintendent/Central Office

2. Years of administrative experience:

- 0-3 years
- 4-7 years
- 8-11 years
- 12-15 years
- 16+ years

3. School District Size Classification: (Iowa High School Boys Basketball Athletic classifcation)

- 1-A
- 2-A
- 3-A
- 4-A

4. I am from AEA:

5. I have completed the ten-day Iowa Evaluator Training.

- Yes
- No

6. There was/is a first or second year teacher in my school district during the 2002-2003 or 2003-2004 school year.

- Yes
- No

7. I have directly observed and evaluated a first or second year teacher using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria during the 2002-2003 and/or 2003-2004 school years.

- Yes, during 2002-2003 only
- Yes, during 2003-2004 only
- Yes, during both years
- No, (If no, please go to the end of the survey and click done.)

8. If yes, how many first and/or second year teachers did you evaluate?

9. In my building a first or second year teacher was identified as incompetent by using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria.

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

10. If yes above, how many teachers were identified as incompetent?

Next >>

2. Standards and Criteria Data

Please rate each of the following by selecting: 1 - strongly disagree, 2 - disagree, 3 - undecided, 4 - agree, 5 - strongly agree

11. I believe that incorporating the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria for teacher evalaution has improved my school's teacher evaluation process.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree
Response					

12. I believe that mandating statewide teacher evaluation standards and criteria has improved teacher evaluation in the state of Iowa.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree
Response					

13. Incorporating the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria into the teacher evaluation process has increased the time I spend in completing teacher evaluation.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree
Response					

14. Please select the descriptor that best defines the time you now spend on teacher evaluation as compared to past years.

- Less time
- Same
- 25% more time
- 50% more time
- 75% more time
- 100% more time

15. I believe that classroom instruction by beginning teachers will improve as a result of using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria in the teacher evaluation process.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree
Response					

16. I believe that classroom instruction in Iowa will improve as a result of using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria in the teacher evaluation process.

	Strongy disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree
Response					

17. My district will be ready to implement an evaluation process using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria with all teachers by July 1, 2005.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree
Response					

18. My district has already implemented a process using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria with all teachers.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree
Response					

19. I expect student achievement in my district will improve as a result of implementing the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria in my school's teacher evaluation process.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree
Response					

20. I expect student achievement in Iowa will improve as a result of implementing the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria in Iowa schools.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree
Response					

<< Prev **Next >>**

3. Training and Staff Development Data

Please rate each of the following by selecting: 1 - strongly disagree, 2 - disagree, 3 - undecided, 4 - agree, 5 - strongly agree

21. Having completed the ten-day evaluator training, I am better able to identify effective teaching than prior to the ten-day training.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Response					

22. Additional state support is needed to effectively implement the Iowa Teaching Standa and Criteria into the teacher evaluation process in my district.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree
Response					

23. Additional administrator training about identifying teacher effectiveness is needed for teacher evaluation.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Response					

24. Additional administrator training about teacher evaluation using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria is needed.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Response					

25. Additional teacher training about identifying teacher effectiveness is needed.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Response					

26. Additional teacher training about teacher evaluation using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria is needed.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree
Response					

<< Prev **Next >>**

4. Open Ended Responses

Please respond to the following open ended items to provide for a deeper understanding of your thoughts and opinions about teacher evaluation and the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria.

27. If you believe you are now better able to complete teacher evaluations, explain why you believe this.

28. If you believe you are not any better able to complete teacher evaluations, explain why you believe this.

29. If you agreed with item #22, by giving it a rating of agree, or strongly agree, that additional state support is needed to effectively implement the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria into the teacher evaluation process in your district, what specific type of state support do you believe is needed?

30. Please briefly describe your district's previous evaluation process. (examples: rating or number ranking system, narrative, checklist, clinical supervision, etc.)

31. Please commment on any aspect of teacher evaluation that may be helpful in understanding your perceptions about teacher evaluation and the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria.

Thank you for your time, thoughts, and comments about teacher evaluation in your district and in Iowa. If you would like to receive a summary of the study results please email me at bamendt@johnston.k12.ia.us
Again, thank you!

<< Prev **Done >>**

Appendix E

Administrative Grade Levels Supervised

ANOVA Item Data

Table E

Administrative Grade Levels Supervised

Item 11. I believe that incorporating the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria for teacher evaluation has improved my school's teacher evaluation process.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
Elementary	100	380	3.800	0.687	0.829	0.083
Middle School	65	246	3.785	0.859	0.927	0.115
High School	81	299	3.691	1.041	1.020	0.113

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	0.581	2	0.291	0.342	0.711	3.033
Within Groups	206.269	243	0.849			
Total	206.850	245				

Item 12. I believe that mandating statewide teacher evaluation standards and criteria has improved teacher evaluation in the state of Iowa.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
Elementary	100	371	3.710	0.733	0.856	0.086
Middle School	65	235	3.615	0.865	0.930	0.115
High School	81	278	3.432	0.923	0.961	0.107

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	3.498	2	1.749	2.106	0.124	3.033
Within Groups	201.851	243	0.831			
Total	205.350	245				

Table E continued
Administrative Grade Levels Supervised

Item 13. Incorporating the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria into the teacher evaluation process has increased the time I spend in completing teacher evaluation.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
Elementary	100	446	4.460	0.736	0.858	0.086
Middle School	65	288	4.431	0.655	0.809	0.100
High School	81	362	4.469	0.577	0.760	0.084

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	0.057	2	0.028	0.043	0.958	3.033
Within Groups	160.951	243	0.662			
Total	161.008	245				

Item 15. I believe that classroom instruction by beginning teachers will improve as a result of using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria in the teacher evaluation process.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
Elementary	100	377	3.770	0.745	0.863	0.086
Middle School	65	241	3.708	0.804	0.897	0.111
High School	81	297	3.667	0.700	0.837	0.093

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	0.490	2	0.245	0.329	0.720	3.033
Within Groups	181.156	243	0.745			
Total	181.646	245				

Table E continued
Administrative Grade Levels Supervised

Item 16. I believe that classroom instruction in Iowa will improve as a result of using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria in the teacher evaluation process.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
Elementary	99	363	3.667	0.714	0.845	0.085
Middle School	65	233	3.585	0.872	0.934	0.116
High School	80	289	3.613	0.620	0.787	0.088

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	0.289	2	0.145	0.200	0.819	3.033
Within Groups	174.772	241	0.725			
Total	175.061	243				

Item 17. My district will be ready to implement an evaluation process using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria with all teachers by July 1, 2005.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
Elementary	99	405	4.091	0.655	0.809	0.081
Middle School	65	277	4.262	0.446	0.668	0.083
High School	81	333	4.111	0.550	0.742	0.082

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	1.264	2	0.632	1.119	0.328	3.033
Within Groups	136.736	242	0.565			
Total	138.000	244				

Table E continued
Administrative Grade Levels Supervised

Item 18. My district has already implemented a process using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria with all teachers.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
Elementary	100	308	3.080	1.953	1.398	0.140
Middle School	65	210	3.231	1.868	1.367	0.170
High School	81	249	3.074	1.669	1.292	0.144

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	1.127	2	0.564	0.307	0.736	3.033
Within Groups	446.454	243	1.837			
Total	447.581	245				

Item 19. I expect student achievement in my district will improve as a result of implementing the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria in my school's teacher evaluation process.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
Elementary	99	328	3.313	0.748	0.865	0.087
Middle School	64	201	3.141	0.758	0.870	0.109
High School	79	252	3.190	0.746	0.863	0.097

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	1.321	2	0.660	0.881	0.416	3.034
Within Groups	179.179	239	0.750			
Total	180.500	241				

Table E continued
Administrative Grade Levels Supervised

Item 20. I expect student achievement in Iowa will improve as a result of implementing the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria in Iowa Schools.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
Elementary	100	337	3.370	0.720	0.849	0.085
Middle School	65	207	3.185	0.778	0.882	0.109
High School	81	258	3.185	0.853	0.923	0.103

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	2.033	2	1.016	1.305	0.273	3.033
Within Groups	189.317	243	0.779			
Total	191.350	245				

Item 21. Having completed the ten-day evaluator training, I am better able to identify effective teaching than prior to the ten-day training.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
Elementary	100	315	3.150	0.977	0.989	0.099
Middle School	64	193	3.016	1.031	1.016	0.127
High School	80	234	2.925	1.058	1.028	0.115

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	2.306	2	1.153	1.133	0.324	3.033
Within Groups	245.284	241	1.018			
Total	247.590	243				

Table E continued
Administrative Grade Levels Supervised

Item 22. Additional state support is needed to effectively implement the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria into the teacher evaluation process in my district.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
Elementary	100	341	3.410	1.214	1.102	0.110
Middle School	64	225	3.516	1.460	1.208	0.151
High School	80	278	3.475	1.215	1.102	0.123

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	0.466	2	0.233	0.182	0.834	3.033
Within Groups	308.124	241	1.279			
Total	308.590	243				

Item 23. Additional administrator training about identifying teacher effectiveness is needed for teacher evaluation.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
Elementary	100	265	2.650	1.038	1.019	0.102
Middle School	64	178	2.781	0.999	1.000	0.125
High School	80	232	2.900	1.078	1.038	0.116

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	2.797	2	1.398	1.343	0.263	3.033
Within Groups	250.888	241	1.041			
Total	253.684	243				

Table E continued
Administrative Grade Levels Supervised

Item 24. Additional administrator training about teacher evaluation using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria is needed.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
Elementary	100	251	2.510	0.959	0.980	0.098
Middle School	64	186	2.906	0.943	0.971	0.121
High School	80	223	2.788	1.182	1.087	0.122

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	***P-value***	*F crit*
Between Groups	6.939	2	3.470	3.374	**0.036**	3.033
Within Groups	247.815	241	1.028			
Total	254.754	243				

Item 25. Additional teacher training about identifying teacher effectiveness is needed.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
Elementary	100	353	3.530	0.918	0.958	0.096
Middle School	64	242	3.781	0.809	0.899	0.112
High School	80	294	3.675	0.906	0.952	0.106

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	2.582	2	1.291	1.458	0.235	3.033
Within Groups	213.398	241	0.885			
Total	215.980	243				

Table E continued
Administrative Grade Levels Supervised

Item 26. Additional teacher training about teacher evaluation using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria is needed.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
Elementary	100	348	3.480	0.899	0.948	0.095
Middle School	63	235	3.730	1.071	1.035	0.130
High School	78	273	3.500	1.032	1.016	0.115

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	2.729	2	1.364	1.383	0.253	3.034
Within Groups	234.873	238	0.987			
Total	237.602	240				

Appendix F
Years of Administrative Experience
ANOVA Item Data

Table F
Years of Administrative Experience

Item 11. I believe that incorporating the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria for teacher evaluation has improved my school's teacher evaluation process.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
0-3 Years	28	112	4.000	0.519	0.720	0.136
4-7 Years	36	140	3.889	0.844	0.919	0.153
8-11 Years	56	211	3.768	1.127	1.062	0.142
12-15 Years	39	150	3.846	0.660	0.812	0.130
16 + Years	57	193	3.386	0.991	0.996	0.132

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	***P-value***	*F crit*
Between Groups	10.303	4	2.576	2.920	**0.022**	2.414
Within Groups	186.123	211	0.882			
Total	196.426	215				

Item 12. I believe that mandating statewide teacher evaluation standards and criteria has improved teacher evaluation in the state of Iowa.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
0-3 Years	28	107	3.821	0.745	0.863	0.163
4-7 Years	36	132	3.667	0.971	0.986	0.164
8-11 Years	56	200	3.571	1.086	1.042	0.139
12-15 Years	39	143	3.667	0.544	0.737	0.118
16 + Years	57	188	3.298	0.892	0.944	0.125

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	6.675	4	1.669	1.909	0.110	2.414
Within Groups	184.418	211	0.874			
Total	191.093	215				

Table F continued
Years of Administrative Experience

Item 13. Incorporating the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria into the teacher evaluation process has increased the time I spend in completing teacher evaluation.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
0-3 Years	28	127	4.536	0.776	0.881	0.167
4-7 Years	36	152	4.222	0.749	0.886	0.144
8-11 Years	56	253	4.518	0.618	0.786	0.105
12-15 Years	39	174	4.462	0.623	0.790	0.126
16 + Years	57	266	4.667	0.369	0.607	0.080

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	4.472	4	1.118	1.879	0.115	2.414
Within Groups	125.528	211	0.595			
Total	130.000	215				

Item 15. I believe that classroom instruction by beginning teachers will improve as a result of using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria in the teacher evaluation process.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
0-3 Years	28	107	3.821	0.597	0.772	0.146
4-7 Years	36	138	3.833	0.829	0.910	0.152
8-11 Years	56	214	3.821	0.768	0.876	0.117
12-15 Years	39	145	3.718	0.787	0.887	0.142
16 + Years	57	198	3.474	0.754	0.868	0.115

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	4.774	4	1.194	1.580	0.181	2.414
Within Groups	159.429	211	0.756			
Total	164.204	215				

Table F continued
Years of Administrative Experience

Item 16. I believe that classroom instruction in Iowa will improve as a result of using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria in the teacher evaluation process.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
0-3 Years	28	100	3.571	0.772	0.879	0.166
4-7 Years	36	137	3.806	0.847	0.920	0.153
8-11 Years	56	206	3.679	0.658	0.811	0.108
12-15 Years	39	143	3.667	0.807	0.898	0.144
16 + Years	55	189	3.436	0.695	0.834	0.122

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	3.437	4	0.859	1.159	0.330	2.415
Within Groups	154.904	209	0.741			
Total	158.341	213				

Item 17. My district will be ready to implement an evaluation process using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria with all teachers by July 1, 2005.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
0-3 Years	28	110	3.929	0.513	0.716	0.135
4-7 Years	36	159	4.417	0.364	0.604	0.101
8-11 Years	55	231	4.200	0.644	0.803	0.108
12-15 Years	39	158	4.051	0.366	0.605	0.097
16 + Years	57	232	4.070	0.638	0.799	0.106

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	4.790	4	1.198	2.265	0.063	2.415
Within Groups	111.024	210	0.529			
Total	115.814	214				

Table F continued
Years of Administrative Experience

Item 18. My district has already implemented a process using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria with all teachers.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Average*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
0-3 Years	28	75	2.679	1.263	1.124	0.212
4-7 Years	36	128	3.556	1.283	1.132	0.189
8-11 Years	56	176	3.143	2.052	1.432	0.191
12-15 Years	39	112	2.872	1.799	1.341	0.215
16 + Years	57	176	3.088	2.010	1.418	0.188

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	14.555	4	3.639	2.060	0.087	2.414
Within Groups	372.774	211	1.767			
Total	387.329	215				

Item 19. I expect student achievement in my district will improve as a result of implementing the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria in my school's teacher evaluation process.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
0-3 Years	27	89	3.296	0.601	0.775	0.149
4-7 Years	36	119	3.306	0.847	0.920	0.153
8-11 Years	56	185	3.304	0.906	0.952	0.127
12-15 Years	39	124	3.179	0.730	0.854	0.137
16 + Years	55	165	3.000	0.778	0.882	0.119

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	3.468	4	0.867	1.094	0.361	2.415
Within Groups	164.851	208	0.793			
Total	168.319	212				

Table F continued
Years of Administrative Experience

Item 20. I expect student achievement in Iowa will improve as a result of implementing the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria in Iowa Schools.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
0-3 Years	28	96	3.429	0.847	0.920	0.174
4-7 Years	36	120	3.333	0.800	0.894	0.149
8-11 Years	56	187	3.339	0.774	0.880	0.118
12-15 Years	39	131	3.359	0.762	0.873	0.140
16 + Years	57	170	2.982	0.803	0.896	0.119

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	6.114	4	1.528	1.927	0.107	2.414
Within Groups	167.368	211	0.793			
Total	173.481	215				

Item 21. Having completed the ten-day evaluator training, I am better able to identify effective teaching than prior to the ten-day training.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
0-3 Years	28	98	3.500	0.926	0.962	0.182
4-7 Years	35	105	3.000	0.882	0.939	0.159
8-11 Years	56	175	3.125	1.166	1.080	0.144
12-15 Years	39	122	3.128	1.167	1.080	0.173
16 + Years	57	156	2.737	1.019	1.009	0.134

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	***P-value***	*F crit*
Between Groups	11.901	4	2.975	2.833	**0.026**	2.415
Within Groups	220.537	210	1.050			
Total	232.437	214				

Table F continued
Years of Administrative Experience

Item 22. Additional state support is needed to effectively implement the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria into the teacher evaluation process in my district.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
0-3 Years	28	99	3.536	1.295	1.138	0.215
4-7 Years	35	118	3.371	1.476	1.215	0.205
8-11 Years	56	197	3.518	1.054	1.027	0.137
12-15 Years	39	134	3.436	1.252	1.119	0.179
16 + Years	57	195	3.421	1.462	1.209	0.160

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	0.728	4	0.182	0.140	0.967	2.415
Within Groups	272.602	210	1.298			
Total	273.330	214				

Item 23. Additional administrator training about identifying teacher effectiveness is needed for teacher evaluation.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
0-3 Years	28	77	2.750	1.231	1.110	0.210
4-7 Years	35	99	2.829	0.852	0.923	0.156
8-11 Years	56	155	2.768	0.945	0.972	0.130
12-15 Years	39	110	2.821	1.046	1.023	0.164
16 + Years	57	150	2.632	1.380	1.175	0.156

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	1.227	4	0.307	0.279	0.892	2.415
Within Groups	231.210	210	1.101			
Total	232.437	214				

Table F continued
Years of Administrative Experience

Item 24. Additional administrator training about teacher evaluation using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria is needed.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
0-3 Years	28	73	2.607	0.988	0.994	0.188
4-7 Years	35	98	2.800	0.929	0.964	0.163
8-11 Years	56	150	2.679	1.058	1.029	0.137
12-15 Years	39	108	2.769	1.024	1.012	0.162
16 + Years	57	144	2.526	1.254	1.120	0.148

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	2.262	4	0.565	0.526	0.717	2.415
Within Groups	225.626	210	1.074			
Total	227.888	214				

Item 25. Additional teacher training about identifying teacher effectiveness is needed.

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
0-3 Years	28	110	3.929	0.810	0.900	0.170
4-7 Years	35	127	3.629	0.770	0.877	0.148
8-11 Years	56	205	3.661	0.810	0.900	0.120
12-15 Years	39	142	3.641	0.815	0.903	0.145
16 + Years	57	196	3.439	1.143	1.069	0.142

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	4.641	4	1.160	1.299	0.272	2.415
Within Groups	187.592	210	0.893			
Total	192.233	214				

Table F continued
Years of Administrative Experience

Item 26. Additional teacher training about teacher evaluation using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria is needed.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
0-3 Years	28	106	3.786	1.063	1.031	0.195
4-7 Years	35	125	3.571	0.723	0.850	0.144
8-11 Years	56	208	3.714	0.790	0.889	0.119
12-15 Years	38	137	3.605	0.840	0.916	0.149
16 + Years	56	182	3.250	1.282	1.132	0.151

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	8.223	4	2.056	2.156	0.075	2.415
Within Groups	198.293	208	0.953			
Total	206.516	212				

Appendix G

School Classification Size
ANOVA Item Data

Table G
School Classification Size

Item 11. I believe that incorporating the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria for teacher evaluation has improved my school's teacher evaluation process.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
1-A	62	231	3.726	1.022	1.011	0.128
2-A	42	163	3.881	0.644	0.803	0.124
3-A	53	203	3.830	0.951	0.975	0.134
4-A	57	198	3.474	0.932	0.966	0.128

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	5.186	3	1.729	1.907	0.130	2.648
Within Groups	190.426	210	0.907			
Total	195.612	213				

Item 12. I believe that mandating statewide teacher evaluation standards and criteria has improved teacher evaluation in the state of Iowa.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
1-A	62	222	3.581	0.838	0.915	0.116
2-A	42	148	3.524	0.987	0.994	0.153
3-A	53	195	3.679	0.953	0.976	0.134
4-A	57	199	3.491	0.826	0.909	0.120

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	1.083	3	0.361	0.405	0.750	2.648
Within Groups	187.366	210	0.892			
Total	188.449	213				

Table G continued
School Classification Size

Item 13. Incorporating the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria into the teacher evaluation process has increased the time I spend in completing teacher evaluation.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
1-A	62	278	4.484	0.680	0.825	0.105
2-A	42	187	4.452	0.595	0.772	0.119
3-A	53	243	4.585	0.401	0.633	0.087
4-A	57	256	4.491	0.754	0.869	0.115

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	0.493	3	0.164	0.268	0.849	2.648
Within Groups	129.002	210	0.614			
Total	129.495	213				

Item 15. I believe that classroom instruction by beginning teachers will improve as a result of using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria in the teacher evaluation process.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
1-A	62	228	3.677	0.681	0.825	0.105
2-A	42	160	3.810	0.646	0.804	0.124
3-A	53	203	3.830	0.913	0.955	0.131
4-A	57	203	3.561	0.786	0.887	0.117

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	2.506	3	0.835	1.100	0.350	2.648
Within Groups	159.531	210	0.760			
Total	162.037	213				

Table G continued
School Classification Size

Item 16. I believe that classroom instruction in Iowa will improve as a result of using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria in the teacher evaluation process.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
1-A	62	227	3.661	0.621	0.788	0.100
2-A	42	151	3.595	0.588	0.767	0.118
3-A	53	191	3.604	0.975	0.987	0.136
4-A	55	198	3.600	0.800	0.894	0.121

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	0.166	3	0.055	0.074	0.974	2.648
Within Groups	155.885	208	0.749			
Total	156.052	211				

Item 17. My district will be ready to implement an evaluation process using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria with all teachers by July 1, 2005.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
1-A	61	254	4.164	0.473	0.688	0.088
2-A	42	178	4.238	0.527	0.726	0.112
3-A	53	216	4.075	0.533	0.730	0.100
4-A	57	233	4.088	0.653	0.808	0.107

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	0.812	3	0.271	0.495	0.686	2.648
Within Groups	114.239	209	0.547			
Total	115.052	212				

Table G continued
School Classification Size

Item 18. My district has already implemented a process using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria with all teachers.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
1-A	62	183	2.952	1.752	1.321	0.168
2-A	42	133	3.167	2.093	1.447	0.223
3-A	53	155	2.925	1.648	1.284	0.176
4-A	57	187	3.281	1.777	1.333	0.177

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	4.909	3	1.636	0.909	0.437	2.648
Within Groups	377.895	210	1.800			
Total	382.804	213				

Item 19. I expect student achievement in my district will improve as a result of implementing the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria in my school's teacher evaluation process.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Average*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
1-A	62	199	3.210	0.791	0.890	0.113
2-A	42	139	3.310	0.902	0.950	0.147
3-A	53	175	3.302	0.753	0.868	0.119
4-A	54	162	3.000	0.755	0.869	0.118

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	3.220	3	1.073	1.351	0.259	2.648
Within Groups	164.420	207	0.794			
Total	167.640	210				

Table G continued
School Classification Size

Item 20. I expect student achievement in Iowa will improve as a result of implementing the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria in Iowa Schools.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
1-A	62	202	3.258	0.883	0.940	0.119
2-A	42	141	3.357	0.674	0.821	0.127
3-A	53	172	3.245	0.689	0.830	0.114
4-A	57	181	3.175	0.969	0.984	0.130

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	0.803	3	0.268	0.328	0.805	2.648
Within Groups	171.571	210	0.817			
Total	172.374	213				

Item 21. Having completed the ten-day evaluator training, I am better able to identify effective teaching than prior to the ten-day training.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
1-A	61	190	3.115	1.003	1.002	0.128
2-A	42	139	3.310	0.804	0.897	0.138
3-A	53	165	3.113	1.141	1.068	0.147
4-A	57	157	2.754	1.189	1.090	0.144

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	8.269	3	2.756	2.630	0.051	2.648
Within Groups	219.055	209	1.048			
Total	227.324	212				

Table G continued
School Classification Size

Item 22. Additional state support is needed to effectively implement the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria into the teacher evaluation process in my district.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
1-A	61	225	3.689	1.085	1.041	0.133
2-A	42	141	3.357	1.162	1.078	0.166
3-A	53	187	3.528	1.062	1.030	0.142
4-A	57	184	3.228	1.608	1.268	0.168

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	6.943	3	2.314	1.875	0.135	2.648
Within Groups	257.967	209	1.234			
Total	264.911	212				

Item 23. Additional administrator training about identifying teacher effectiveness is needed for teacher evaluation.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
1-A	61	184	3.016	0.783	0.885	0.113
2-A	42	106	2.524	0.987	0.994	0.153
3-A	53	134	2.528	1.216	1.103	0.151
4-A	57	158	2.772	1.215	1.102	0.146

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	***P-value***	*F crit*
Between Groups	9.044	3	3.015	2.881	**0.037**	2.648
Within Groups	218.702	209	1.046			
Total	227.746	212				

Table G continued
School Classification Size

Item 24. Additional administrator training about teacher evaluation using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria is needed.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
1-A	61	183	3.000	0.900	0.949	0.121
2-A	42	105	2.500	0.988	0.994	0.153
3-A	53	135	2.547	1.137	1.066	0.146
4-A	57	141	2.474	1.039	1.020	0.135

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	***P-value***	*F crit*
Between Groups	10.749	3	3.583	3.535	**0.016**	2.648
Within Groups	211.843	209	1.014			
Total	222.592	212				

Item 25. Additional teacher training about identifying teacher effectiveness is needed.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
1-A	61	227	3.721	0.638	0.799	0.102
2-A	42	140	3.333	1.057	1.028	0.159
3-A	53	194	3.660	0.998	0.999	0.137
4-A	57	205	3.596	1.031	1.015	0.134

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	4.075	3	1.358	1.485	0.220	2.648
Within Groups	191.202	209	0.915			
Total	195.277	212				

Table G continued
School Classification Size

Item 26. Additional teacher training about teacher evaluation using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria is needed.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Mean*	*Variance*	*SD*	*SE*
1-A	61	227	3.721	0.638	0.799	0.102
2-A	42	141	3.357	1.113	1.055	0.163
3-A	53	192	3.623	0.970	0.985	0.135
4-A	55	190	3.455	1.215	1.102	0.149

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	4.129	3	1.376	1.425	0.237	2.648
Within Groups	199.994	207	0.966			
Total	204.123	210				